THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

ALL Christian preachers to-day are confronted by a twofold task. They must first gain a sure grasp of the message they are commissioned to proclaim; then they must learn to proclaim it as something relevant to the lives of their hearers. They must, therefore, know their New Testament, for there the message is to be found. They must also understand what we sometimes call 'the modern man,' since he is the hearer. He thinks the thoughts and speaks the language of the twentieth century and of Western civilization. He is not acquainted with the Bible, and not much interested in the Church. So for him not only must the language of the New Testament be translated from Greek into English, but the thought-forms and picture language of first century Palestine must also be translated into their equivalent in our modern idiom. This important problem of 'communication' is the concern of Professor Amos N. WILDER in his book, *New Testament for To-day*.[1]

In our generation the Bible has again been established among theologians as the supreme source of the Faith. The characteristic theology of to-day is Biblical theology. There are, however, marked differences even among Biblical theologians. Some are content to proclaim dogmatically what the Bible says, reiterating and emphasizing the formulas and conceptions in which the message clothed itself in the first century, with little or no attempt to interpret it in modern categories, or show its relevance in the context of modern thought and practice. Others, however, aim at separating the basic message of the Bible from the merely topical and temporary garments in which it is clothed, and sometimes, as in the case of Bultmann, seem prepared even to discard altogether the outmoded dresses. They seek to isolate the essential message from the picture language in which it is so memorably presented (and which is so misleadingly called 'myth'), and offer it only in the solemn, dull language of factual prose.

Professor WILDER shares with Bultmann his distress at the 'false impression the New Testament makes on many men to-day.' 'They shrug it off as a collection of writings full of absurdities and fables,' 'a compendium of myths and legends.' He shares, too, his eagerness to make the gospel relevant for to-day, and also his honesty in facing a difficult problem. He does not, however, accept Bultmann's method of dispensing with 'picture language' in favour of 'the prose of religion.' He sees imaginative presentation as essential to religion, indeed to all the high moments of human experience. Not only do the poets speak in symbols, but even the upsurgings of merely secular faiths, such as Nazism, use symbolic language in the presentation of their ideologies. The Christian faith also needs this weapon. Picture language should therefore not be discarded, but explained and interpreted in modern words and shown to be relevant, in its essential content, to our modern situation.

The symbols of the New Testament are borrowed mainly from the Old Testament, and less frequently from familiar features of Hellenistic religions. They fail, however, to evoke in modern readers the same response they could awaken in the hearts of the first Christians. To-day they sound antiquated and obscure—the Kingdom of God, the Son of Man and His Coming on the clouds of heaven, justification and 'righteousness,' the second Adam and the heavenly man, evil spirits, the world rulers of this darkness, and even the Holy Spirit are like foreign coins, whose value in our own currency is quite unappreciated. Yet they all had vivid and poignant significance for their first readers. We must ask therefore: What was this significance?

[1] S.C.M.; 15s. net.

What was the fundamental truth which these strange words and phrases were able to convey in the first century? and in what new words and thoughts can the same truth be conveyed to-day to modern listeners?

In the chapter on 'The Proclamation of Jesus,' the theme of 'The Kingdom of God' is discussed with special care. The message, 'The time is fulfilled; the kingdom of God is at hand,' made a powerful impact on the hearers of Jesus. By means of it 'He cast a spark into the powder magazine of their deepest will and dreams.' It meant that 'everything most deeply important to the Jew . . . was now at stake . . . and on the point of fulfilment.'

In what way can the essential truth of this message be presented to-day? Professor WILDER makes this suggestion: 'We may venture to modernize his words and say that he was announcing a sublime Tomorrow for mankind, or rather for that remnant of mankind that would fulfil the conditions required.' 'Man is a creature that is born to be surpassed.' This 'Tomorrow' is not to be relegated to a future beyond this earthly stage (as Neo-Orthodoxy claims), nor must it be assigned merely to an earthly future (as the old liberals argued). For the Jews and for Jesus earthly future and transcendent future were commonly merged. So it must be in our interpretation.

Those theologians who ascribe the Kingdom entirely to the transcendent sphere, and allow to it no moral or social implications in this present world, are particularly rebuked. To abandon all hope of improvement here on earth is to reckon too lightly with the power of the Holy Spirit and to limit the power of God. Moreover it is to play into the hands of those who scorn the gospel as an opiate of the people. It is true that 'the greater goals of faith' lie beyond our life in the flesh, but they are 'not discontinuous with it.'

Two chapters which follow are entitled 'The Message of Paul' and 'The Johannine Witness,' and these themes are dealt with in the same forthright way. In the concluding chapter a further discussion of Bultmann is included, particularly his attempt to re-interpret the message of the New Testament in terms of current existential philosophy. This is found to be illuminating but inadequate and often misleading.

This book attempts a very necessary task, and does it both interestingly and courageously, and with unmistakable earnestness and conviction.

Although so much has been written about the Servant of the Lord in the New Testament, and especially about the question whether Jesus Himself interpreted His mission in terms of the Servant-teaching, doubts and hesitations on this issue are still entertained sometimes in surprising quarters. In a recent review, for example, a by no means radical New Testament scholar wrote: 'But in many minds there may still be considerable doubt whether Jesus viewed His death very strongly in the light of Is 53, or whether sacrifice was so dominating a thought with Him as Dr. Taylor has always maintained.' In 'The Servant-Messiah' [1953] Dr. T. W. Manson asked: 'How does the kingdom come to the Son of man?', and 'What is the Israelite ideal?', and gave the emphatic answer, 'For Jesus the answer to both questions is given in its stark simplicity by defining Son of man in terms of the Servant of the Lord portrayed in Is xl.–lv.' These opinions are widely accepted, at least in Great Britain, but apparently there is still needed a full-scale discussion of the main issue. This discussion was provided five years ago in a long and detailed article in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* by J. Jeremias assisted by W. Zimmerli, and happily it has now been ably translated by Dr. Harold Knight and published in the series 'Studies in Biblical Theology' (No. 20) under the title *The Servant of God*.[1] This scholarly investigation, which extends to one hundred and twenty pages, is an indispensable aid to the study of the New Testament.

The foundations are well and truly laid. W. ZIMMERLI examines the idea of the Servant of God in the Old Testament, the profane and the religious uses of the title *'ebed*, especially in the singular as a description of Israel, as a title for the patriarchs, Moses, kings, prophets, and for the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. The passages 49^{7} 50^{4-9} and 52^{13}–53^{12}, he says, make it clear that the Servant passed through a vale of suffering. The last-named passage, he maintains, 'after echoing clearly traits from the earlier songs, unmistakably abandons the realm of the biographical . . . and gives a picture of the true servant of Yahweh which far transcends the personal experience of the prophet.' 'Thus it is not by chance or by ineptitude that Is 53 has again and again been understood as alluding to the figure of the one that is to come.' This study is followed by an examination of

[1] S.C.M.; 10s. 6d. net.

ranslations in the Septuagint, and in this manner he way is prepared for the distinctive contribution f Professor JEREMIAS which in sixty packed pages iscusses 'the Servant of God' in late Judaism in he period after the Septuagint and in the New estament.

The two questions which are of vital importance r the New Testament expositor are whether in re-Christian Judaism the name 'Servant of God' as used to denote the Messiah and whether Jesus n have known Himself as such. The former estion has generally been answered in the negave and is still answered in this way by most positors. Professor JEREMIAS bids us think gain. He shows that as regards Is $42^{1ff.}$ and 53 a furcation arose in Rabbinic opinion: Hellenistic udaism interprets the Suffering Servant in the llective sense as distinct from the Messianic nterpretation in Palestinian Judaism. 'In particular,' he writes, 'Is 53 in Palestinian, rabbinic udaism of the first millennium A.D. was nowhere ferred to Israel; rather in rabbinic literature the llective application to Israel was strictly confined o those passages and their context where the Hebrew text demanded it.' By means of a careful tudy of Ecclus 48^{10} the Testament of Benjamin , 1 Enoch 37–71, the Peshitta, the later translaons of the Septuagint, the Aramaic Targum on saiah, and the statements of notable Rabbis, he nows (1) that, as in the New Testament, Messianic nterpretation in Palestinian Judaism was limited to Is $42^{1ff.}$ 43^{10} $49^{1f.}$ $^{6f.}$ and $52^{13ff.}$, (2) that for Is $42^{1ff.}$ and $52^{13ff.}$ Messianic interpretation is constant from pre-Christian times, and (3) that 'as far as the Messianic interpretation of the passages about suffering in Is 53^{1-12} is concerned, this can again be traced back with great probability to pre-Christian times.' The Messiah suffers vicariously to expiate the sins of Israel.

As regards the New Testament sayings which reflect the Servant-conception Professor JEREMIAS is prepared to admit that many of them are wholly or in part the work of the Church, but that several considerations forbid us to declare spurious the whole of the references of Jesus Himself to the *'ebed*. That He reckoned with the possibility of a violent death 'has the strongest historical probability behind it.' If so, He must have had thoughts about its meaning, 'especially in view of the extraordinary significance which the doctrine of the expiatory efficacy of death possessed for late Judaism,' and that He found in Is 53 the clue to the necessity and meaning of His passion 'can also claim strong historical probability.' The eucharistic words of Jesus in Mk 14^{24} in view of their numerous Semitic features take us back to the 'thirties. 'Here, therefore, we have before us the bedrock of the tradition.' 'Because He goes to His death innocently, voluntarily, patiently and in accordance with the will of God (Is 53) His dying has boundless atoning virtue. It is life flowing from God, and life in God which He outpours.'

The End of an Endeavour

BY THE REVEREND T. GLYN THOMAS, M.A., WREXHAM

'MEN are not animals erect but immortal gods,' aid Francis Bacon [1561–1626], and with that pronouncement began the endeavour to establish he kingdom of man in the modern world. Scientific humanism, the most popular name for it, has herefore a considerable history. That Bacon hould have dreamt of the lordship of man is not rprising when we consider the times in which e lived. It was the age when sailors were searching the seas with the navigator's compass, astronmers the skies with the telescope, when Columbus as discovering the new world across the Atlantic, enaissance scholars new treasures in old classics, hen the new invention of printing was advancing he frontiers of knowledge, and the Protestant eformers were bringing forth out of the Scriptures new truths. 'The paths trodden by the footsteps of ages were broken up; old things were passing away, and the faith and the life of ten centuries were dissolving like a dream,' wrote Froude.[1] If Bacon had looked more carefully into Holy Writ he would have discovered that Satan had anticipated him, as he has anticipated all the false teaching of men. And if he had looked more carefully into himself, he would have found there too a warning voice, for in his own person he illustrated the dangers of the movement which he pioneered. His mother foresaw it, as mothers often do, and used to pray that 'the same God that hath given them [his brilliant talents] to him

[1] Quoted by Gwilym O. Griffith, *Makers of Modern Thought*, 20.

What was the fundamental truth which these strange words and phrases were able to convey in the first century? and in what new words and thoughts can the same truth be conveyed to-day to modern listeners?

In the chapter on 'The Proclamation of Jesus,' the theme of 'The Kingdom of God' is discussed with special care. The message, 'The time is fulfilled; the kingdom of God is at hand,' made a powerful impact on the hearers of Jesus. By means of it 'He cast a spark into the powder magazine of their deepest will and dreams.' It meant that 'everything most deeply important to the Jew . . . was now at stake . . . and on the point of fulfilment.'

In what way can the essential truth of this message be presented to-day? Professor WILDER makes this suggestion: 'We may venture to modernize his words and say that he was announcing a sublime Tomorrow for mankind, or rather for that remnant of mankind that would fulfil the conditions required.' 'Man is a creature that is born to be surpassed.' This 'Tomorrow' is not to be relegated to a future beyond this earthly stage (as Neo-Orthodoxy claims), nor must it be assigned merely to an earthly future (as the old liberals argued). For the Jews and for Jesus earthly future and transcendent future were commonly merged. So it must be in our interpretation.

Those theologians who ascribe the Kingdom entirely to the transcendent sphere, and allow to it no moral or social implications in this present world, are particularly rebuked. To abandon all hope of improvement here on earth is to reckon too lightly with the power of the Holy Spirit and to limit the power of God. Moreover it is to play into the hands of those who scorn the gospel as an opiate of the people. It is true that 'the greater goals of faith' lie beyond our life in the flesh, but they are 'not discontinuous with it.'

Two chapters which follow are entitled 'The Message of Paul' and 'The Johannine Witness,' and these themes are dealt with in the same forthright way. In the concluding chapter a further discussion of Bultmann is included, particularly his attempt to re-interpret the message of the New Testament in terms of current existential philosophy. This is found to be illuminating but inadequate and often misleading.

This book attempts a very necessary task, and does it both interestingly and courageously, and with unmistakable earnestness and conviction.

Although so much has been written about the Servant of the Lord in the New Testament, and especially about the question whether Jesus Himself interpreted His mission in terms of the Servant-teaching, doubts and hesitations on this issue are still entertained sometimes in surprising quarters. In a recent review, for example, a by no means radical New Testament scholar wrote: 'But in many minds there may still be considerable doubt whether Jesus viewed His death very strongly in the light of Is 53, or whether sacrifice was so dominating a thought with Him as Dr. Taylor has always maintained.' In 'The Servant-Messiah' [1953] Dr. T. W. Manson asked: 'How does the kingdom come to the Son of man?', and 'What is the Israelite ideal?', and gave the emphatic answer, 'For Jesus the answer to both questions is given in its stark simplicity by defining Son of man in terms of the Servant of the Lord portrayed in Is xl.–lv.' These opinions are widely accepted, at least in Great Britain, but apparently there is still needed a full-scale discussion of the main issue. This discussion was provided five years ago in a long and detailed article in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* by J. Jeremias assisted by W. Zimmerli, and happily it has now been ably translated by Dr. Harold Knight and published in the series 'Studies in Biblical Theology' (No. 20) under the title *The Servant of God*.[1] This scholarly investigation, which extends to one hundred and twenty pages, is an indispensable aid to the study of the New Testament.

The foundations are well and truly laid. W. ZIMMERLI examines the idea of the Servant of God in the Old Testament, the profane and the religious uses of the title *'ebed*, especially in the singular as a description of Israel, as a title for the patriarchs, Moses, kings, prophets, and for the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. The passages 49^{7} 50^{4-9} and 52^{13}–53^{12}, he says, make it clear that the Servant passed through a vale of suffering. The last-named passage, he maintains, 'after echoing clearly traits from the earlier songs, unmistakably abandons the realm of the biographical . . . and gives a picture of the true servant of Yahweh which far transcends the personal experience of the prophet.' 'Thus it is not by chance or by ineptitude that Is 53 has again and again been understood as alluding to the figure of the one that is to come.' This study is followed by an examination of

[1] S.C.M.; 10s. 6d. net.

urely St. Paul is nearer to our experience when e cries out, 'My own behaviour baffles me. For find myself not doing what I really want to do ut doing what I really loathe . . . it must be n that has made its home in my nature . . . I ten find that I have the will to do good, but not e power.' [1] And who is there who does not ay with John Drinkwater,

Grant us the will to fashion as we feel,
Grant us the strength to labour as we know?

'If to do were as easy as to know what were od to do . . .'!

Comte [1798–1857], the next thinker of note, ntinued the tradition of glorifying the rational an. He had come under the influence of a ertain Count Claude Henri Saint-Simon who ad propounded a scheme of industrial socialism ith a scientific-romantic humanitarianism for its eligious cult.[2] Saint-Simon dreamt of a new ivilization in which the scientists should take the lace of the priests, in which the captains of in- ustry should supplant the captains of war, in hich industrialism itself should become a sort of hurch—a church whose temples were workshops, hose worship was human service, and whose upreme Being was Humanity in its progress to erfection.[3]

Comte took over the idea, and with him the cientific humanism begun by Bacon may be said o reach its high-water mark. Theology and meta- hysics, he taught, have had their day, at last cience has come into its own. Others had made man the centre of the universe, Comte proceeded o make him God. The new faith for a new world- hurch was to consist of a body of belief based on cience, on the proved certainties of scientific nowledge, and civilized men must be disciplined o take the scientific attitude. The dynamic hich was to inspire this new faith was Humanity tself, a Collective Being, to know and love and erve which was to be the new Catholicity that as to unite the world. Later in his life, having ome under the influence of a certain Madame de aux, Comte planned a World Republic which as to take the place of the Holy Roman Empire. ts medium was to be a world-wide church with a ermanent committee sitting in Paris. And in his church Comte was to be the Pope and Madame e Vaux the Virgin Mary. All of which goes to llustrate the truth of the maxim that whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad.

With the advent of Marx [1818–1883] the move- ment begun by Bacon takes a strange turn. The kingdom is promoted by degrading the king! For what Marx did was to rob man of the reality of his spiritual dignity. The way we think, he taught, is coloured by the kind of society in which we live, and that is fashioned, in its political and spiritual nature, by its method of production. This is what determines all that we think and believe and will. History must be interpreted in terms of economics. The driving force is matter, which means man's relationship to matter, which in turn amounts to his methods of production. Art, philosophy, religion, and every spiritual move- ment are but reflections of the economic struggle. Man makes religion, not religion man, and every- thing that ministers to the material benefits of the economic system is good and proper. In short, the terms 'man' and 'humanity' have lost all moral content. It is obvious that we have come a long way from Bacon and Descartes, a way that they would hardly have recognized.

It is not too much to say that Marx's great con- temporary, Charles Darwin [1809–1882], created a new world-outlook. He was a self-confessed murderer—of special creation, by substituting for it natural selection by a process of chance varia- tions. Up to the time of Darwin the distinction between Nature and man had been taken for granted. Man had been created in God's image and made a living soul through His Spirit, even though his body had come from the dust of the earth. Neither Bacon nor Descartes had doubted this, and Kant had taught it. Darwin cancelled the distinction. Man, he claimed, was the product of evolution and could be completely understood within the natural order. To the question what, therefore, is the ground of ethics, Darwin replied that the first and greatest commandment is: 'Thou shalt struggle for thine existence.' The corollary was the doctrine of the 'survival of the fittest,' which in practice frequently becomes the survival of the most unfit. Morality becomes nothing more than social convention, and the bidding of the Spirit is of no account. Nature cares nothing for morality, the scientific humanists said, and when Matthew Arnold pointed out that human nature does, they came back with the question, what if human nature is simply a product of Nature?

Huxley, Darwin's ablest and most prominent disciple, it was who coined the word 'agnostic,' which he used to describe the attitude of rejecting any faith beyond what science allowed. Every attitude save the scientific was to him dishonest and obscurantist—'theological bacteria'! Wells, an ardent disciple of Huxley, saw that the inter- national implications of all this would be a cease- less struggle between the nations, until the nation

[1] Ro 7^{14ff} (tr. by J. B. Phillips, *Letters to Young Churches*).

[2] G. O. Griffith, *op. cit.*, 115.

[3] *Ib.*

scientifically organized and equipped could destroy its rivals. Political realism meant energetic preparation for this fateful struggle. And, if Darwin's theory was right, who could protest on moral grounds ? Later in his life Huxley saw the peril and revolted against a scientific civilization—inhuman, merciless, non-moral—obeying the blind drive of Nature. He came to realize and to teach that there is in man a spirit that is different from Nature's blind energy, a spirit which makes man refuse to obey the natural order when that is contrary to the biddings of the moral order, and which pits conscience against the cosmic process and challenges it in the name of a higher authority.

Five years ago a lecture was delivered on ' Evolution and Christian Belief,' in which the lecturer, W. H. Thorpe, F.R.S., stated that the old controversy between mechanism and vitalism is dead and that animals are not physico-mechanical systems but psycho-physical, and concluded : ' Western Science and the Christian religion will, in the long run, either progress together or die together.' It would seem that the killer of beliefs has himself suffered a similar fate ! Carlyle had long before expressed himself more vigorously : ' I have no patience with these gorilla damnifications of humanity.'

Nietzsche (1844–1900] proceeded to apply the teaching of Darwin. We must, he taught, reconstruct our morality and our theology in terms of the theory of evolution ; and however unbalanced he may seem to us to be, and however preposterous his ideas, it must be allowed him that he made people consider the moral significance of Darwin's teaching as perhaps no other modern thinker has done. He is famous (or notorious, for our view depends on our point of view !) for his doctrine of the superman. In the struggle called life, the end is not goodness but power, not justice but force, and our need is the creation and exaltation of the ' superior ' man. There are two moralities, that of the masters and that of the masses. The former, and superior, is a morality of courage and daring which we have inherited from the Romans ; the latter, and inferior, a morality of humility and altruism, of love and security, of pity and peace, which we owe to the Hebrew in the days of his humiliation and weakness, and to Saint Paul, ' that dishonest holy epileptic.' The virtues of the herd corrupt the leaders and make them mediocre. It is immoral to say with Kant, ' that great Chinaman of Königsberg,' that what is right for one is right for another. The ' bad ' virtues of the strong are as necessary for society as the ' weak ' virtues of the others, war and oppression as necessary as tenderness and peace. The need is not the elevation of the masses but the evolution of the superman, and this must be accomplished by eugenic breeding. Love is for the rabble. (Incidentally, he himself had been disappointed in love, the lady not loving in return, a fact which will doubtless interest the psychologists among my readers.) Democracy, ' this mania for counting noses,' ' this worship of mediocrity,' must be abandoned, and to this end Christianity must be slain. It was Christ who created democracy, the religion of the slave. ' Shopkeepers, Christians, cows, women, Englishmen, and other democrats belong together.' Nietzsche's chief complaint against Christianity is that it broke the spirit of the strong. But, it must be asked, Who is the strong ? Is it Nietzsche's cruel, unsympathetic, unmerciful ' nobleman ' ? ' His followers,' says Bertrand Russell, ' have had their innings, but we may hope that it is coming rapidly to an end.' There are few, I imagine, who would not agree.

With Freud [1856–1939], man the king, whom Bacon, and his followers over three centuries, would exalt and enthrone, becomes a sorry spectacle indeed. He is not master in his own house, never mind in the Universe. Everything he thinks and does springs from instincts, and they are nothing but a part of the blind mechanism of Nature. Religion is nothing more than a ' pathetic illusion,' and there is nothing left that can be called moral personality. ' Man is reduced to a biochemical phenomenon, his spiritual dignity a fantasy, his moral personality an illusion, and even his rational processes an affair of reflex mechanism. He is left with his instincts, his neuroses, and his Death Wish, but the lord of creation is no longer allowed to be master in his own crumbling house of clay : slave or robot, he is hustled blindly on, in the inexorable cycle of biological events.' [1]

The truth is that the endeavour which began with Bacon collapsed with Freud. And yet in her broadcast talks entitled ' Morals Without Religion,' [2] Mrs. Margaret Knight finds it possible to say, ' The fundamental opposition is between dogma and the scientific outlook. On the one side, Christianity and communism, the two great rival dogmatic systems ; on the other, scientific humanism, which is opposed to both. It is like—what shall I say ?—like trying to combat the belief in flying saucers by reviving the belief in witches riding on broomsticks. I do not want to press the analogy too closely—but what I mean is, it is trying to drive out a new myth by reviving an old one, instead of by going forward to something sounder than myth. Scientific humanism—that is the constructive answer.' But there are horses that are too long dead to be whipped back to life !

[1] G. O. Griffith, *op. cit.*, 202.

[2] Published in *The Listener*, January 13 and 20, 1955.

The Son of Man as Man in the Fourth Gospel

By the Reverend E. M. Sidebottom, B.A., M.Litt., West Hartlepool

It may seem necessary to justify a separate study of the term Son of Man in John, since by then the tradition of its use by Jesus was firmly established, but in fact in the Fourth Gospel the name is used in a way quite peculiar to that work. The Son of Man is the point of union between heaven and earth (Jn 1^{51}); He is the gate of heaven of Jacob's vision (cf. 10^{7}).[1] He alone has descended and ascended (3^{13}; cf. 6^{62});[2] He must be lifted up (3^{14} 8^{28} 12^{34}) and glorified (12^{23} 13^{31}); He gives the bread of life which is His flesh ($6^{27.\ 53}$ and *passim*). Alongside these peculiar associations there are others held in common with the Synoptic tradition, the Son of Man as judge, as Messiah, as Servant of the Lord.[3] This article draws attention to those factors which emphasize the manhood of the Son of Man in John.

Essentially Man. Throughout the Gospel strata the basic meaning of Son of Man as Man is understood.[4] The Q sayings about the homelessness and ordinary social habits of the Son of Man imply this (Lk 9^{58}, Mt 8^{20}, Lk 7^{34}, Mt 11^{19}). The writer of Mt 12^{32} substituted 'men' for Mark's 'sons of men,' thus showing that he knew the meaning of the expression, even if he spoilt the effect by adding 'Son of man' as well. In Mk 2^{10} 'The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins' may at some level of tradition have expressed the truth that Divine forgiveness is made effective in human community: this may be the point of 'on the earth,' and Matthew actually adds, 'they glorified God who had given such power to men' (Mt 9^{8}). The parallelism in Mk $2^{27.\ 28}$ suggests that there too 'Son of man' means 'man': 'the sabbath was made for man'; 'the Son of man is master of the sabbath.'[5] The trait runs through to the most advanced apocalyptic in the Gospels. The late sermon in Mt 25 (Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to Matthew*, 32) contains what seems to be a direct reminiscence of the Similitudes of Enoch;[6] yet here the figure determining the fate of nations judges by his relation to humankind, his identification with humanity in its humblest representatives (Mt 25^{40}).[7]

The expression 'the Son of man' is Christian; Daniel and the Similitudes (if this work is pre-Christian) have 'one like a Son of man' (Dn 7^{13}) and a 'being whose countenance had the appearance of a man' (En $46^{1f.}$), who is afterwards referred to as 'that son of man.'[8] Kraeling gives reason for the view that the presence of the word

[1] Bernard objects to Burney's exegesis on the ground that Nathanael and not Jesus is the type of Israel ('an Israelite in whom is no guile'); but John has combined the idea of the angels going up and down between the ideal and the empirical man (on this see the text later) with that of the *place* being the gate of heaven. Philo makes his Logos the place where heaven and earth are one, John the Son of Man.

[2] The Son of God is only spoken of as ascending possibly at 20^{17} and then not directly.

[3] In the Synoptics, too, Son of Man is a name rather than an interpretation; thus Mk 8^{31} has 'the Son of man' for which Matthew substitutes 'Jesus Christ'; Mk 10^{45} has 'Son of man' where Luke has 'I' (cf. Mt 16^{13} and 12^{8}); Mt 5^{11} has 'for my sake' but Luke 'for the sake of the Son of man' (6^{22}).

[4] Probably *bar-nasha* in Aramaic. Son of Man means just human being in Ignatius, Barnabas, Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, Gregory Naziansen, Chrysostom, Augustine and Jerome, according to Kraeling (*Anthropos and the Son of Man*). The only one to depart from this, he says, is Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, V. xxi. 1. The same is true of the Odes of Solomon which has been noted to have a 'Johannine flavour.'

[5] There is evidence that Jewish thought was reaching out towards a similar teaching on the Sabbath, as indeed might be expected from those who inherited Deuteronomy (see Herbert Loewe in *The Age of Transition* [vol. i. of *Judaism and Christianity*], 167).

[6] Mt 19^{28} 25^{31} both contain the phrase 'throne of his glory'; cf. En 62^{5} $69^{27.\ 29}$, etc. See, however, Sir 40^{1-3}.

[7] The judgment on the unrighteous is on the broadest grounds, 'inasmuch as you did it not to one of the least' whereas the blessing on the righteous, 'unto one of these *my brethren*, even these least' which might be taken to restrict the reference to the elect; though B and two of the Old Latin versions omit 'these my brethren.'

[8] The fact that the being is first introduced as 'one who had the appearance of a man' and only afterwards is 'that son of man' makes Charles' argument that the demonstrative is due to faulty translation superfluous (*Book of Enoch* [1912], 86 f.).

In the Christian Apocalypse in the New Testament the Son of Man likewise does not appear; it is once more 'one like a son of man.' In Rev 14^{14} it is not a man at all that is meant but an angel as in Dn 10^{16}, cf. 8^{15}. In Rev 1^{13} the figure is a compound of the Ancient of Days in Dn 7^{13} and the figures in Dn $10^{5f.}$, and Ezk $9^{2.\ 11}$ (LXX).

' like ' in the Daniel passage implies that the ' one like a son of man ' is of the genus man, though more than an ordinary man (*Anthropos and the Son of Man*, 143 f.).[1] The language of Enoch (' that son of man ') and of 2 Es 13^3, where ' the likeness of a man ' is referred to as ' that man ' suggests that the tradition stemming from Daniel followed this line.[2] There is something to be said for the view that, although *bar enash* and not *ben adam* is used in Daniel, the passage looks back to the human dominion over the beasts in Gn 2 (Thornton, *The Dominion of Christ*, 78, 11, *n.* 1; Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 117, *n.* 2). Westcott says, ' The divine kingdom is being contrasted with the kingdoms of the world. These are presented under the images of beasts. The brute forces symbolized them, just as man, to whom originally dominion was given, symbolized the rightful sovereignty which was to be established ' (*The Gospel according to St. John*, 34).[3] That sovereignty (and therefore ' judgment ') is the characteristic of manhood is the theme right through to the Wisdom Literature.[4] In Ezk $1^{26.\ 28}$ ' the appearance of a man ' is also ' the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord.' [5] Man in his ideal aspect is the type of Divine dominion. The author of Ps 8 sets the two aspects of man side by side :

What is man, that thou art mindful of him ?
And the son of man, that thou visitest him ?
For thou hast made him but little lower than God,
And crownest him with glory and honour.
Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands ;
Thou hast put all things under his feet (Ps 8^{4-6}).

The author of Hebrews declares that Ps 8 refers not to man as he is, who has not everything subject to him, but to Jesus, who for a little while was made lower than the angels, crowned with glory and honour for the suffering of death, so that by the grace of God He might taste death for every one (He 2^{6-9}). Jesus alone fulfils the purpose and nature of man, and ' brings many sons to glory.' The drift shows that the ' children ' of *v.* 13 are children of God, not of Christ. The ' sons ' of *v.* 10 are then sons of God, whom Christ is not ashamed to call brethren (*vv.* 11–13), because they and He are of one origin (*v.* 11), and share the same nature (*v.* 14). ' For it was fitting that He, for whom and by whom all things exist, in bringing many sons to glory, should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through suffering. For He who sanctifies and those who are sanctified have all one origin. That is why He is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, " I will declare thy name unto My brethren." . . . Since therefore the children share in flesh and blood, He Himself likewise partook of the same nature. . . . He had to become like His brethren in every respect ' (He $2^{10-12.\ 14.\ 17}$).[6]

This use of the psalm does not seem to originate with the author of Hebrews. It is quoted by St. Paul in 1 Co 15^7 along with Ps 110^1; and this is connected with the Danielic Son of Man in the words attributed to our Lord before the High Priest (Mk 14^{62}; cf. Ps 110^1 and Dn 7^{13}).[7] St. Paul's use of the Ps 8^7 passage with its equation ' son of man '=' man ' and his reference to Christ in the same place as ' *anthropos* ' suggests that this was how he translated the name Son of Man. The explanations of our Lord as the Last Adam and as Head of the Body are connected,[8] in that they express the faith that He is to be identified with mankind ; for the rabbis used the body of Adam as symbol for the unity of mankind.[9] There is

[1] The angels in Dn 10^{16} and 8^{15} are not referred to as ' like a son of man ' but ' like the appearance of a son of man ' and ' like the appearance of a man.' Montgomery (*Daniel* in *I.C.C.*) declares that the figure in 7^{13} is (*a*) ' a man ' (p. 319) and (*b*) Israel (p. 323).

[2] Reference to the sea, etc., in 2 Esdras and the clouds of heaven show dependence on Daniel.

[3] The point holds even if, as Kraeling urges, no abstract symbolizing is intended, ' the ideas of type and correspondence to type being the product of western abstract thought ' (*Anthropos and the Son of Man*, 133).

[4] Wis $10^{1.\ 2}$: ' Wisdom guarded to the end the first formed father of the world. . . . And gave him strength to get dominion over all things.' Wis 9^{1-3} : ' O God, who madest all things by thy word ; and by thy wisdom formedst man, that he should have dominion over the creatures made by thee, and rule the world in holiness and righteousness, and execute judgment in uprightness of soul ' : cf. Eph 4^{24} and Jn 5^{27}.

[5] Cf. Ex 24^{17}, and S. H. Hooke on the image in, *In the Beginning*, 37.

[6] The author of Hebrews identifies Jesus with man as he should be (which I have called man in his ideal aspect) and not necessarily with any Ideal Man in the Platonic sense.

[7] The phrase ' Danielic Son of Man ' is used to denote the New Testament title when it has Danielic associations, and not to suggest that the words ' son of man ' constitute a title in Daniel. Burney also held that 1 Co 15^{45} is ' wholly a quotation ' and that ' some time before St. Paul wrote his Epistle in A.D. 55–56, the antithesis between the first Adam and Christ as the second Adam had been worked out in Christian Rabbinic circles, and was used in argument ' (*The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, 45–47).

[8] Last Adam : see Sir 24^{28} ; Head : Col 1^{18}.

[9] Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 57. See Rendel Harris, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, 67ff. ; Col $1^{21.\ 22}$, 1 Co 12^{12-27}, Eph 4^{25}, Ro $12^{4.\ 5}$.

the possibility that the Wisdom language ich is used about Christ in Colossians recalls Ur-Mensch who is practically identified with sdom.

ervant. The one like a son of man in Dn 7 pro- sses from oppression to triumph; he stands for el. So does the son of man of Ps 80[17. 18], where e term is applied either to Israel or to a ssianic figure representative of Israel.'[1] This n of Man is 'the man of thy right hand' and y have suggested the connexion between Dn 7[13] Ps 110[1], noted above. But the form of nph in Ps 80 is described as renewed life,[2] and s is the combination in Mark, and not just ply apocalyptic son of man plus Suffering vant of Isaiah, though there is a hint of resur- tion here also.[3] The references to Second Isaiah Mark's Son of Man are sought in the words 'for ny' in Mk 10[45] 14[24] which are thought to be m Is 53[11] and in the connexion which Dodd has ablished between Mk 9[12] and Is 53[3].

Philippians 2[7] practically defines manhood as very: 'taking the form of a slave, being born the likeness of men.' The word 'slave' is inter- angeable with 'servant' in the Septuagint sion of Isaiah,[4] and the word for 'emptied' in 7. 8 ('emptied himself . . . unto death') is d elsewhere in the same version for the Hebrew rd rendered 'poured out' in Is 53[12] ('poured t his soul unto death').[5] Isaiah 52[13] (LXX) ls of the exaltation and glorification of the vant; Ph 2[9] tells of the exaltation of the slave. e Servant here, too, seems to be connected with e Danielic one like a son of man; Lohmeyer clares that nowhere else in the Greek Bible is *uretheis* followed by *hōs* as in Ph 2[8]. This, he ys, is moreover contrary to Greek idiom, which s simply the nominative after the passive of *urisko.* Consequently *hōs* goes closely with thropos and recalls Dn 7[13]. Lohmeyer also held that Is 53 was interpreted by the Rabbis in the light of the vague *Ur-mensch* speculations, and connected Ph 2[6] 'to be on an equality with God' with the temptation of Adam and Eve to become 'as God' or 'as gods.'[6]

The Influence of Ezekiel. It is hard to see why writers so consistently ignore or minimize the influence of the Son of Man in Ezekiel on the New Testament usage.[7] Only here in pre-Christian literature is the expression certainly a title; it occurs about a hundred times in all, six times as many as in the rest of the Old Testament.[8] At the word of God (who appears as the likeness of a man) the Divine spirit enters into the Son of Man and He speaks with God on an equality ('stand upon thy feet and I will speak with thee,' Ezk 2[1. 2]). The Matthæan, Lukan and Johannine versions of the Baptism reflect the language of Ezk 1[1]: 'the heavens were opened, and I saw,' and in the only reference to the Son of Man outside the Gospels the martyr Stephen sees 'the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God' (Ac 7[56]). Jesus' words, 'The Son of man came to seek and to save the lost' (Lk 19[10]), are a quotation from Ezk 34[16] where the reference is to sheep as in Lk 15[4-7]. The Greek version, of course, makes no distinction between *bar nasha* and *ben adam.*

Curtis (*Jesus Christ the Teacher,* 138 ff.) has drawn attention to Ezekiel's influence on the recorded character and words of our Lord. 'The Prophet's transportation in a vision to the holy City and to the Temple and to a very high mountain (Ezk 8[3] 11[1] 40[2]) is recalled in the Wilderness Temptation of Jesus. He also like Jesus made use of parables, with the vine among other themes: "Ah Lord God! they say of me, Is he not a (mere) speaker of parables?" (Ezk 20[49]). . . . He sees Israel as a flock scattered and

'Who by divine help emerges from humiliation to mph' (Dodd, in Manson's *A Companion to the ble,* 374). Dodd further points out that in the LXX e parallel between Israel as the Vine and the Son of n is clearer: 'Visit this Vine and restore it . . . d the son of man whom you have made strong. . . .' the Vine in Jn 15.

[2] Ps 80[18]; note the parallel with Hos 6[2].

[3] Especially in Duhm's reconstruction: Oesterley d Robinson, *Hebrew Religion and Its Developments.* e expression 'sons of men' actually appears in rallelism with 'man' in Is 52[14]: 'His face was rred beyond that of men and his form from that of e sons of men.'

[4] Is 49[3. 5]; see Dodd, *According to the Scriptures,* 91; 118 n.

[5] See Dodd, *According to the Scriptures,* 92; *J.T.S.,* xix. 292.

[6] Gn 3[5]; cf. Jn 10[34]. Lohmeyer in Lowther-Clarke, *New Testament Problems* [1929], 143 ff. from *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums,* iii. 482. But the last words must not be taken to imply that Christ for Paul was not Divine if celestial at some point in his career; there is no evidence that *harpagmos* could be used in a depreciatory sense. See Liddell and Scott.

[7] Dodd, *According to the Scriptures,* 187 n. 1: 'The frequently recurrent "Son of Man" in Ezekiel may no doubt have been in the minds of the early Christians, but proof that it was so is lacking in the New Testament.' Contrast J. Y. Campbell, 'Son of Man' in Richardson's, *Theological Word-book,* and Preiss, 'Son of Man' in *Life in Christ,* 46.

[8] Curtis, *Jesus Christ the Teacher,* 137. Abelson says, 'The first chapter of Ezekiel worked wonders on the old Hebrew imagination. Commentaries on almost every word were composed wholesale

shepherdless (Ezk $34^{5.6}$).[1] He sets Israel over against her "sisters" Sodom and Samaria as meriting still sterner judgment.[2] He is bidden to say, "He that heareth, let him hear" (Ezk 3^{27}), and to pronounce woes. He offers forgiveness and mercy and new life or resurrection of her dead bones. The Spirit lifts him up and bears him whithersoever it wills. . . . "And thou, Son of Man, be not afraid of them, neither be afraid of their words, though briers and thorns be with thee, and thou dost dwell among scorpions" (Ezk 2^{3-6}). . . . Surely, if I sent thee to them, they would hearken unto thee. . . . But thou, Son of Man, behold, they shall lay hands upon thee, and shall bind thee with them. . . . But when I speak with thee, I will open thy mouth, and thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God: he that heareth let him hear (Ezk $3^{25.27}$). . . . Son of Man, thou dwellest in the midst of the rebellious house, which have eyes to see and see not, and have ears to hear and hear not (Ezk $12^{1.2}$). . . . Son of Man, cause Jerusalem to know her abominations (Ezk 16^{2}). . . . Son of Man, speak unto the elders of Israel. . . . Wilt thou judge them, Son of Man? (Ezk $20^{3.4}$). . . . Son of Man, prophesy, and say, "A sword, a sword" (Curtis, *Jesus Christ the Teacher*, 138–139 abridged).

Curtis' own comment is: 'In face of so varied a responsibility and so wide a commission the fitness of Ezekiel's special title is unmistakable. It is as "son of man" that he has been called and commissioned. Israel's birthright and privilege have been forfeited. A man is needed, a child of humanity is burdened with the misery and evil of mankind. Impartially he is moved to view all nations and to cast the net of judgment over all. Again and again this Old Testament son of man is commanded to "judge" both Israel and its prosperous enemies' (Curtis, 139, 140).

The Suffering Righteous One. Wisdom's connexion with manhood is expressed in the remarkable portrait in Wis 2, which recalls in one phrase the ideal man of Plato,[3] but, in fact, goes back to Isaiah (Wis 2^{12} is almost word for word a quotation from Is 3^{10} LXX) and probably to the Suffering Servant. The language of Wisdom is loosely connected with the Son of Man teaching in the mouth of our Lord; his activities are justified as 'Wisdom is justified by her children (or, works)' (Lk 11^{49} 7^{35}, Mt 11^{19}). The words of 'the wisdom of God' at Lk 11^{49} are on the theme of the suffering of God's servants. The Wisdom passage about the suffering righteous one has numerous echoes in the New Testament:

Let us lie in wait for the Righteous One. . . .
He professeth to have knowledge of God,
And nameth himself Servant of the Lord. . . .
And vaunteth that God is his Father. . . .
For if the Righteous One is Son of God, he will uphold him. . . .
With outrage and torture let us put him to the test (Wis 2^{12-19}).

It is scarcely necessary to quote parallels. Matthew 11^{27} = Lk 10^{22}, the 'bolt from a Johannine sky' is Jesus' profession of knowledge of God; He says He came to serve; He calls God His Father; His temptation is that God will uphold Him (Mt $4^{5f.}$ = Lk $4^{9f.}$); He is to be tortured and outraged. The combination of Ps 2^{7} and Is 42^{1} in Mk 1^{11} is anticipated in the Wisdom passage; the Suffering Servant is already the Son of God.

Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel

The Wisdom influence is plainly visible in the Fourth Gospel and in particular the influence of Wis 2 with its picture of the suffering Righteous One. Ezekiel, too, is evident; while the vine allegory of Jn 15 recalls Jeremiah and Isaiah, the relation of the 'parable' in Ezk 17 is closer:[4] its branches and the cutting of it are mentioned, and the teller of the allegory is called 'Son of Man' (Ezk $17^{6.8.9.2}$). The identification of vine and branch ('son' in Hebrew) and Son of Man in Ps $80^{8.14.15.17}$ may conceivably have entered John's mind also. So may the words of Ps $8^{4.5.6}$, for in his writing the words 'honour' and 'glory' recur, along with the idea that God has put all things into the hands of the Son of Man (Jn 13^{3}). Most of this is conjecture, but the relation to Ezekiel, for instance, may lend support to the view that John moulded his portrait of Christ 'upon the prophetic model' (Dodd, *The Fourth Gospel*, 255). And, of course, Ezekiel once more provides not only the motif but also some of the details for the shepherd and flock allegory in Jn 10 (one flock, one shepherd [Ezk 34^{23}]).

Servant. Though John avoids the name 'Servant' as he avoids the word 'Image,' Jesus is nevertheless the Servant of the Lord in the Fourth Gospel. The first appearance of the title Son of Man bears this out. In the passage from the *Bereshith Rabba* fastened upon by Burney, Odeberg and Dodd, the Image, the ideal Israel, which the angels find when they ascend, is what is referred to in Is 49^{3}: 'Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified.' Indeed, the Fourth Gospel shows many traces of Isaianic language: 'witness,' 'know,' 'believe,' 'I am he,'

[1] Manson, in his *Servant-Messiah*, connects the flock without a shepherd with a leaderless army.

[2] The judgment on Sodom, of course, appears as a theme elsewhere in the Old Testament.

[3] Plato, *Republic*, ii. 361 E, quoted by Clem. Alex., *Strom*, v. 14.

[4] Jer 22^{24}, Is 5^{2}.

and, if we accept the *Aleph* version of Jn 1^{34}, 'chosen' as applied to Christ, are all Johannine and also from Isaiah—the last being the word for the Servant. Moreover, despite Bernard,[1] the expression 'to lift up' used in John seems to go back to Isaiah: cf. Is 52^{13} LXX 'Behold, my servant shall understand, and be exalted, and glorified exceedingly' with Jn 3^{14} 12^{34}: 'The Son of man must be exalted.'[2] The word for 'exalted' is used for the 'lifting up' on the Cross. John says that Isaiah saw His glory and wrote of Him (Jn 12^{41}). The glory of the Incarnation is manifested fully in the passion; in Nairne's words, John's theme is 'glory in humiliation.' To drive this home, John narrates the story of the feet-washing. 'Jesus knowing that His hour had come . . . knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands, and that He had come from God and was going to God, rose from supper, laid aside His garments and girded Himself with a towel. Then He poured water into a basin and began to wash the disciples' feet and to wipe them with the towel . . .' (Jn 13^{1-5}). The Master and Lord takes the part of the slave, and those who will not accept Him as such have no part with Him ($13^{4.8}$) 'who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be equal with God, but poured Himself out, and took the form of a slave, being made in the likeness of men' (Ph $2^{6.7}$). The Son of Man in John is also the *'Ebed Yahweh*, Servant and Slave. It is a picture of what is to come, for the Lord is to be crucified like any slave; He claims no privilege in the humanity He shares with the lowliest: John is at one with Paul, Hebrews, and Mt 25^{31-46}. Judas goes out, and it is night (13^{30}). At once Jesus says, 'Now is the Son of man glorified and in Him God is glorified. If God is glorified in Him, God will also glorify Him in Himself, and will glorify Him at once' ($13^{31.32}$). 'My servant shall understand, he shall be lifted up and glorified exceedingly' (Is 52^{13} LXX). [*To be continued.*

[1] Bernard tries to refute the equation 'lifting up' = 'exaltation' by denying that the bystanders in Jn 8^{28} understood anything except 'death' by it. But we have to assume a Johannine vocabulary everywhere in the Fourth Gospel; there is no other reason for believing that the crowd would know that 'lifting up' =death. Schlatter held that 'lifting-up' stood for 'crucifixion' in Northern Syria, though not necessarily in Jesus' time, but Burkitt denied that the expression could mean this in Aramaic (Lee, *Religious Thought of St. John*, 148).

[2] Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 92, points out that Is 52^{13} has many echoes in John.

Literature

FAITH AND FREEDOM

This first series of Professor Leonard Hodgson's Gifford Lectures—*For Faith and Freedom*, vol. i. (Blackwell; 21s. net)—can be assured of popularity and a wide circle of readers, especially among the clergy.

In the first chapter Professor Hodgson contrasts the position in theology to-day with the position in his student days before the First Great War, and analyses the causes and significance of some of the changes that have taken place. In the second chapter he does the same for philosophy, and also examines some of the assumptions involved in his own professed belief that the universe does in the last resort 'make sense.' He then goes on to raise some of the basic puzzles and difficulties which must beset any thinker who shares this fundamental belief; and since, for the Christian, they will have to be tackled on the basis of faith and in the light of revelation, Professor Hodgson rounds off the first half of his book with a very lively and provocative discussion of faith and revelation.

The second half opens with an attempt to define the true Christian meaning of the doctrine of creation and its implications in terms of human freedom; in the remainder of the book Professor Hodgson discusses how this doctrine, properly understood, will throw light on a number of the perennial philosophical problems. Here the discussion of evil is noteworthy, not least for its moderation and the claims it does *not* make.

It may be worthwhile to look briefly at the characteristics, so well exemplified in these lectures, which have given so wide a currency to Professor Hodgson's books and views, especially in the Church of England.

There is first his complete frankness with his readers. His arguments are never narrowly academic; they are based on the whole range of his experience, and Professor Hodgson is clearly ready to share that experience, and his conclusions from it, with his readers. We feel we know the whole man. It is, for example, most endearing to be told (as we are more than once) that the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford is by no means insensible to the charms of 'Amaryllis'; by this and countless other touches, the ordinary reader is made to feel that here is a man in all points like

himself—his views are not simply the fruit of abstract thinking ' untinctured with a single drop of practice ' ; they deserve the respect due to the honest reflections of any man who has had a full experience of life and has faced up to its implications. Professor Hodgson is so palpably an honest man.

Then again, for all his obvious learning, Professor Hodgson is very much the theologian of common sense ; there is much rigorous argument here, but its terms and presuppositions are not such as need baffle the non-specialist, if he is prepared to put in some reasonably hard work. It is perhaps the combination of this common sense with courage that most commends Professor Hodgson. For example, his arguments about the nature of revelation and justification so carry us along by their conformity to robust common sense that we hardly realize that what is being said is something in its own way quite radical, which, had it been said in the tortuous German of some Continental theologian, might have seemed dangerous and subversive. Yet Professor Hodgson is not deterred by fear of seeming novel or shocking ; it must have required real courage to criticise so roundly the views of Barth and Cullmann (surely a palpable hit there), not to mention those of Farrer and Father Thornton. Even those who do not agree with Professor Hodgson should be grateful to him for having raised these difficulties about the traditional position and shown that they arise from factors genuinely inherent in the situation and not from some specifically Continental temperament or rationalism.

This, then, is popular theology in the best sense of the term ; important things are said and said clearly and fearlessly. But it would be idle to pretend that the book is wholly satisfying ; indeed its deficiencies are the very defects of its virtues. Again and again the critical reader will find himself exclaiming ' Yes, but. . . .' The second criticism follows on from that ; Dr. Hodgson is better when he is being negative than when he attempts positive construction. Frequently his criticisms seem well founded, and in its general tendency the book seems to strive for the things most of us would want to uphold ; but when Professor Hodgson has criticised the views of others, his own solutions often seem to raise as many questions as they settle. For example, his criticism of the traditional ' two source ' theory of revelation will find echoes in many minds, but to one reader at least the character of the ' insight ' and ' illumination ' in terms of which he himself would explain the matter is far from clear.

A third criticism is especially pertinent in the case of Gifford Lectures. Dr. Hodgson writes : ' For some years now. . . . I have felt in philosophical circles that I am an outsider.' That is exactly the impression that a lot of this book gives. Those acquainted with the areas and terms in which the vital issues of religion and philosophy are nowadays being fought out will have the uncomfortable feeling, as they read this book, that it is not in these terms that the really serious battle is being carried on. This is in fact a book which is more likely to help the theologian than the philosopher.

D. E. Nineham

CHURCH DOGMATICS

The editors of Karl Barth's *Church Dogmatics* have probably acted wisely in arranging for this volume—part one of vol. iv. : *The Doctrine of Reconciliation* (tr. G. W. Bromiley : T. and T. Clark ; 50s. net)—to appear relatively earlier in English than in the original for it deals with matters that are agreed by all theologians and ministers of the gospel to be of central importance. Further, although its place in the larger work is clear, this volume would be intelligible and impressive apart from the others. In other words we would recommend those who have not yet made a start on reading Barth to make a beginning with this volume. Massive themes are here treated in a massive way and no brief review could do justice to it.

The heart of the work is concerned with the Person and Work of Jesus Christ and though British thinkers are rarely quoted one cannot fail to be struck by the remarkable similarity of the approach to that of P. T. Forsyth. The stress on the finality of Christ's victory over sin, the perfection of His obedience to the Father and the renewal of man through Christ is strikingly reminiscent of the great Congregationalist theologian's chapter on ' The Threefold Chord.'

In a section entitled ' The Judge Judged in Our Place ' Barth argues strongly and cogently for the view that Christ acted as our representative and substitute. In his earlier writings he has prepared his readers for the substitutionary concept but here he deals with it at length. The One who gives His life a ransom for many pays ' on their account but without their co-operation what they cannot pay for themselves.' When He sheds His blood for many ' it is His blood which is shed and not a drop of theirs.' He takes the burden of our sin upon Himself in real earnest and it thereby ceases to be ours. Barth goes so far as to say that God's sentence on the sin of man fell upon God Himself in the Person of His Son. Jesus thus stands under the wrath and judgment of God. He is broken and destroyed by God. Again and again Barth returns to the cry of dereliction.

Another point at which there is a close similarity to Forsyth is in the emphasis placed on the racial

significance of the work of Christ. Barth protests against the common view that Christ wrought a work which is valid and adequate for all but appropriated by people singly. All were reconciled to God in Christ, in His life, death and resurrection. Though none but believers are aware of this no degree of unbelief can destroy the fact, as no degree of unbelief or of sin can destroy the fact that human nature is good. Barth's position here seems to imply the absolute predestination of all men to salvation, yet he often writes about the fall into nothingness as though he believed in conditional immortality.

In his exposition of the Person of Christ he strongly upholds the fact of kenosis though he holds closely to the traditional position with regard to the continuing work of the Eternal Son in the cosmos, and in this respect differs from Forsyth. He is very critical of those who try to ' solve the christological mystery by juggling it away.' Here he is thinking chiefly of those who hold to subordinationism or modalism, though he says most theologians tend to the one or the other.

It is not until he has developed his theology of reconciliation that he directs his attention to the doctrine of sin. This he maintains is the correct order for sin can only be understood in the light of what God has done in Christ to countermand it. Such an approach is a sure safeguard against treating sin lightly, as a necessary stage in man's growth, for example, and no less against a dualism which would allow that sin could ever defeat the purpose of God. ' Evil is a form of that nothingness which as such is absolutely subject to God.' The Fall of Adam is typical of the fall of all his successors but is no excuse for it. Guilt is not passed on by heredity.

Of the section of ' Justification by Faith ' all that need be said is that it reaches the high level that would be expected.

This is a volume that has something for every one. The severest critic of neo-orthodoxy cannot fail to find inspiration and illumination through poring over its pages. PERCY SCOTT

SEX IN CHRISTIANITY

Here is an important book for the minister and the psychiatrist—*Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis*, by Professor William Graham Cole (Allen and Unwin ; 21s. net). Dr. Cole gives us one of the most exhaustive studies of the natural and Hellenistic attitudes to sex and shows how wrong we are to think that Christianity has always tabooed sex. Paul is so often accused of belittling marriage and sex that it was refreshing to see that Paul's attitude was determined by his eschatological ideas and not by a Hellenistic attitude to sex. The contrast which Dr. Cole makes between the natural attitude in which sex is accepted without any suspicion of uncleanness and the Hellenistic, dualistic attitude with its opposition of spirit and flesh, body and mind is excellently done. Both Old and New Testaments, he contends, held to the natural attitude to sex and not to the Hellenistic. His insight into the mind and teaching of Jesus, Paul and Augustine is really profound. Through St. Thomas Aquinas and the Council of Trent he gives us the classical attitude to sex ; and through a study of Luther and John Calvin we get the classical Protestant attitude. Passing to contemporary religious attitudes he takes Dr. Weatherhead, Otto Piper, Niebuhr and Brunner as representative of the Protestant attitude of to-day, and he does the same with Father Messinger's volume ' Two Made One Flesh,' and radio Bishop Fulton Sheen's writings to give us the modern Roman Catholic attitude. Then he passes to a study of Freud and writers of to-day such as Karen Horney to get the psycho-analytic attitude. Finally, in part three Dr. Cole gives us a critical Christian interpretation of sex. I congratulate him not only on a fine contribution to our Christian thought, but also on his excellent methodology.

J. G. MCKENZIE

THE DEAD SEA SCRIPTURES

An amazing feature of the mass of publications dealing with the Dead Sea Scrolls is the comparative paucity of translations and until recently the complete absence of a popular rendering of all the available scrolls in a handy volume by a single author giving the work his own imprint and uniformity. Of course, there have been translations of single scrolls and fragments, and in Professor Millar Burrows' book and latterly in Father Vermès' book a section is devoted to a translation of scrolls from Cave One.

The omission has been made good, however, by Professor T. H. Gaster who in *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation* (Doubleday and Co., New York ; 95c.) has assembled and translated the available scrolls and lengthier fragments (the ' Genesis Apocryphon ' [1956] is not included, for obvious reasons, nor are the Biblical texts, for other obvious reasons). They provide the material for the greater part of this book of three hundred and fifty pages ; the author's notes, introductory discussions, lists of sources, and indexes taking only about one-third.

Commendable, too, is Professor Gaster's division of the material into four main sections. *The Service of God : Rules of the Brotherhood* contains the Manual of Discipline, Zadokite Document, Formulary of Blessings (Barthelemy and Milik,

Qumrân Cave 1) ; *The Praise of God : Hymns and Psalms* are from the Thanksgiving scroll, and ' The Hymn of the Initiants ' from the Manual of Discipline ; *The Word of God : The Study of the Scriptures* has the *pesher* scrolls of Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Ps 37, and ' The Oration of Moses ' (from Barthelemy-Milik) ; *The Triumph of God : Descriptions of the Final Age* includes the Warfare scroll and three further fragments from Barthelemy-Milik.

Professor Gaster explains that his technique is to render prose documents in idiomatic English and poetry in Biblical language (though I am not sure that ' cronies ' is a suitable word to look for in Cruden's !) ; consequently he has effectively reflected one of the major literary characteristics of the Scrolls.

An important innovation is the author's theory that such terms as Righteous Teacher (which he renders variously), Wicked Priest, etc., refer to officers and not to single individuals. It is an attractive idea and at first sight affords a legitimate means of avoiding the need to identify them. But I do not think it is a real solution, for the need to identify the officer in any given context is still present, and the theory is seriously weakened by the absence from the scrolls of any evidence that the office was ' a kind of apostolic succession.' Was the office hereditary, or was there election to it, or was the officer self-appointed ? There is no answer to any of these questions in the Scrolls.

B. J. Roberts

BAPTISM

The subject of baptism has been widely discussed in recent years and it is clearly exercising the thought of members of many churches. Baptists have taken little part in this discussion, though a large work on Baptism in the New Testament has appeared in German from the pen of Professor Johannes Schneider, who is a Baptist Professor in the University of Berlin. Now a smaller work by the same author has been translated by Dr. E. A. Payne, under the title *Baptism and Church in the New Testament* (Carey-Kingsgate Press ; 3s. 6d. net). The author quotes a remarkable observation of Luther's, that ' without personal faith no one should be baptized,' and argues for this position. He examines the origins of Christian baptism, and dismisses Jewish proselyte baptism and the sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls from the discussion, confining himself to the baptism of John. Here he exposes himself to some criticism. He is on stronger ground when he turns to the theology of baptism in the New Testament, and to the study of the relation between faith and baptism there. He emphasizes the relation between baptism and the Church, and the dilemma created by infant baptism. If baptism makes one a member of the Church, then infant communion should be its corollary—as it used to be, and as it still is in the Eastern Church. If baptism does not make one a member of the Church, then churches should not reckon their numbers by ' baptized members.' This issue is therefore crucial for the doctrine of the Church. Small though this book is, it should not be neglected by any interested in the current discussions.

H. H. Rowley

SCOTLAND AND WESTERN EUROPE

Students of Scottish history, and especially of Scottish Church history, will turn with expectation to the latest volume in the Chalmers Lectureship series—*The Kirk and the Continent*, by the Rev. Dr. Andrew L. Drummond (Saint Andrew Press ; 25s. net).

Dr. Drummond set himself the task of surveying the comings and goings between Scotland and Western Europe since the Reformation, taking the ecclesiastical as the dominant but not the exclusive interest. It may be said at once that he has accomplished the task with real success, providing not only a work which students will value and keep for reference, but also telling an attractive story in which any reader of history may take delight. We are glad to note that he gives good space to John Durie who travelled widely over the Continent in the seventeenth century as an apostle of Christian unity, and to ' Stewart of Leghorn ' who did so much to inspire the Waldenses in the nineteenth century. Both should be better known. It may be news to some readers that Scotland repaid the debt to Switzerland incurred at the time of the Reformation by the lay ministries of Robert Haldane and Thomas Erskine of Linlathen nearly a century and a half ago. All this and much more is to be found in these pages ; and the book is characterized by the erudition which the author has manifested in his earlier works, and by the balanced judgment whose estimates will give general, if not universal, satisfaction.

Salutary is mis-spelt on pages x and 65 ; and I have also noted errors on p. 135, note 2 and p. 242, line 2.

Stewart Mechie

In *Religious Factors in Mental Illness* (Allen and Unwin ; 16s. net) Professor Wayne E. Oates breaks new ground. It is well known that religious ideas often pre-occupy the minds of the mentally ill. Here Dr. Oates and his team of students have made an excellent analysis of the kind of ideas

which often are the content of neurotic and psychotic symptoms. What are the types of religions likely to be associated with the ideas of the unpardonable sin, the Second Coming of our Lord, the fear of the wrath of God, and Messianic delusions? Are they of diagnostic or prognostic value? This book will be found most profitable for the understanding of those mentally ill people who are filled with guilt-feelings or obsessed with some kind of religious ideas.

The debate between revelation and reason has not been confined to Christian circles. In Islam it lasted for centuries, and an excellent account of it has been given by Professor A. J. Arberry in *Revelation and Reason in Islam* (Allen and Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). Orthodox doctrine teaches that the Koran is not merely a revelation mediated through Muhammad, but that it is the eternal, uncreated word of God. This doctrine was not, however, generally accepted without serious controversy. Its upholders disputed with the Mu'tazilites who, although they were not strictly rationalists, held that the Koran was created. When we come to men like Rhazes, Farabi, Avicenna and Averroes we find a philosophical approach to knowledge. A different approach was made by the Isma'ilis who sought their authority in a leader from the family of the Prophet and produced what Professor Arberry calls 'the mystery religion *in excelsis*.' There were also the mystics who sought through personal communion with the Creator by way of spiritual discipline to prove the truths of the Divine Unity which theologians and philosophers laboriously sought to expound. This book, which contains the Forwood Lectures for 1956 delivered in the University of Liverpool, gives a clear account of the different schools of thought with many quotations from the writings of their exponents.

The twenty-fourth volume of the 'Ancient Christian Writers' series is Tertullian, *The Treatise against Hermogenes*, translated and annotated by Professor J. H. Waszink (Longmans; 21s. net; 18s. for standing orders). Hermogenes was a doubly refuted heretic, for Theophilus dealt with his views when he was in Antioch, as Tertullian later did when he was in Carthage. The particular heresy of Hermogenes was that he denied creation out of nothing. He insisted that creation was made out of unborn and uncreated matter. His argument is that, if creation was out of nothing, then God is the creator of evil; and that, since God is always called Lord, He must always have been Lord of something, even before there was a world. These are the views with which Tertullian deals with his characteristic trenchancy.

This is a very useful volume, because, although translations of this work already exist, there is to all intents and purposes no annotated edition. Professor Waszink has done his work well. The Introduction is lucid and illuminating; there is an excellent analysis of the work; the translation sounds ugly, but the ugliness is deliberate, because Professor Waszink purposely translates literally, and therefore retains Tertullian's long and involved sentences. The notes are adequate, and the chapters in the notes are prefaced with helpful paraphrases.

A feature of the work is the careful attention to the text. Professor Waszink has just published an edition of the text of 'Adversus Hermogenem,' and here, within the necessary limits, we receive the benefit of his researches. In a scholarly series this is a volume of outstanding scholarship.

And Some Evangelists, by Mr. Peter Morgan (Oliphants; 2s. 6d. net), presents a useful survey of the campaigns in the British Isles conducted by four American evangelists—Moody, Sankey, Torrey and Alexander. An estimate of the ecclesiastical background and of the evangelists' methods is included; and a final chapter brings the whole into relation with Billy Graham's crusades in Britain.

A Year with the Bible, by Principal John Marsh, D.D. (S.C.M.; 15s. net), sets out to give daily Bible readings for a year. As Principal Marsh writes: 'The present set of readings is meant to provide a sufficient selection from the Scriptures to enable us to see for ourselves what the meaning of life is, and in what a tremendous context it has been set.'

The book begins with an excellent introduction on 'The Bible and the Faith.' It is in nine sections —The Way of Understanding, The Old Way, The Way of Meditation, The Way of Wisdom, The Way of Realization, two sections on The Way of Appropriation, The Way of Expectation, What Shall I Render? We can imagine no better way in which to read the Old Testament than that which is offered in this volume. The text of the readings is not printed; the notes are brief, pointed and helpful.

This is a wholly excellent book, which will enable the reader to study the Bible with both devotion and understanding. We have only one complaint —the price is going to put it out of reach of many to whom it would be most useful. There could not be a better book to put into the hands of a young person, but how many young people can, or will, buy a book at this price? Could we not have a cheaper and less elaborately produced edition of this book, for a book like this deserves the widest circulation?

Expository Problems

The Unforgivable Sin

By the Reverend Owen E. Evans, M.A., B.D., Hartley Victoria College, Manchester

In this article it is proposed *first*, to attempt to determine the original form of our Lord's saying concerning the unforgivable sin; *secondly*, to inquire whether we can place the saying in the original context in which it was uttered; and *thirdly*, to consider its meaning.

I

The saying occurs in all three Synoptic Gospels, in the following forms:

Mt $12^{31f.}$ (R.V.)
'Therefore I say unto you, Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come.'

Mk $3^{28f.}$ (R.V.)
'Verily I say unto you, All their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and their blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: but whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin.'

Lk 12^{10} (R.V.)
'And every one who shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven.'

A comparison of the three passages clearly points to the conclusion that Luke represents the Q form of the saying, and that Matthew, true to its normal tendency, has conflated the Markan and Q forms. In our search for the original form, therefore, we may confine ourselves to a comparison of Mark and Q (as preserved by Luke).

The main difference between the two forms is, of course, that in Q blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is contrasted with blasphemy [1] against the Son of Man, whereas in Mark the contrast is with the sins and blasphemies committed by the sons of men (Mark does not specify against whom these sins and blasphemies are reckoned to be directed). It is highly probable that Mark's 'sons of men' and Q's 'Son of Man' both derive from the ambiguous expression *bar nasha* in the original Aramaic form of the saying. Leaving aside, for the moment, the question of the sense in which Jesus used the term *bar nasha* in this context, we may note that the Q form of the saying provides a striking example of Semitic antithetic parallelism:

Every one who shall blaspheme against *bar nasha*
will be forgiven;
But he that blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will
not be forgiven.

The Markan form of the saying is manifestly less parallelistic and more developed. Two considerations establish a presumption in favour of Q, as against Mark, as being the closer to the original words of Jesus: (i) the fact that much of the teaching of Jesus, as C. F. Burney has shown,[2] was clothed in such Semitic poetic forms as parallelism; and (ii) the fact that the tendency, in the course of the transmission of the gospel tradition, was not to subtract from, or simplify, the words of Jesus, but rather to add to, and develop them in order to bring out their relevance to the situation of the primitive Church.[3] If then we can discover motives that would convincingly account for the development of the saying into its Markan form, the case for the priority of the Q form will be a very strong one.

Such motives are not difficult to find. In view of the growing tendency, in the Early Church, to understand *bar nasha* in the Messianic sense, the simple parallelistic saying would be capable of being interpreted as implying a distinction between

[1] 'Speak a word against' in the Greek version of Q is equivalent to 'blaspheme against,' since the same Aramaic phrase could be rendered into Greek by either of these expressions. See T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 216 n.

[2] C. F. Burney, *The Poetry of Our Lord*. Cf. the words of T. W. Manson (*op. cit.*, 53): 'The fact that many utterances of Jesus are cast in poetic form is of course very important, in one direction especially. The recovery of the true text of these utterances in cases where divergent versions lie before us can frequently be helped by observing which of them best preserves the parallelism or rhythm or even rhyme. Such a test must be applied with caution . . . but within its limits the test of poetic form is a useful one.'

[3] Cf. the words of J. Jeremias concerning the parables (*The Parables of Jesus* [Eng. tr. by S. H. Hooke] 23): 'In many cases comparison of the parallel forms in which the parables have come down to us shows that they have undergone elaboration, and that the simpler version represents the original.' What is true of the parables is equally true of the sayings in general.

blasphemy against Christ and blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (indeed the Greek version of Q, as the text of Lk 12^{10} and Mt 12^{32} reveals, did so interpret it). In order to avoid such an interpretation, the tradition underlying Mark may have modified the saying, retaining the expression *bar nasha* but referring it, not to the object of the blasphemy but to the recipient of the forgiveness. The saying in this modified form, however, would still be ambiguous; 'shall be forgiven to *bar nasha*' might be misunderstood as implying that the Son of Man needed forgiveness. In order to remove this ambiguity, the singular may well have been changed to the plural, thus giving the 'shall be forgiven unto the sons of men' of Mark's text. Another natural tendency would be to emphasize the gravity of the unforgivable blasphemy, by (*a*) extending the promise of forgiveness in the first half of the saying so that it applied, not only to blasphemy against one's fellow-men, but to 'all their sins . . . and their blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme'; and (*b*) by strengthening the 'will not be forgiven' of the second half of the saying to 'hath *never* forgiveness,' and adding the further comment 'but is guilty of an eternal sin.' [1]

If we conclude, in the light of the foregoing considerations, that the simple, parallelistic version of Q represents the more faithfully the original words of Jesus, we are still faced with the important question as to the sense in which He used the term *bar nasha* in this saying. In spite of the fact that the Greek version of Q, from which Luke and Matthew derived the saying, apparently understood the term in the Messianic sense, it is very improbable that such was the sense intended. It is incredible that Jesus drew a distinction between blasphemy against the Messiah and blasphemy against the Holy Spirit by whose power the Messiah fulfilled His ministry. Moreover, the saying preserved in Lk $12^{8f.}$ (which in Q stood adjacent to our saying) is hardly consistent with the view that Jesus taught that blasphemy against the Messiah was forgivable.[2] We are thus left with the alternative possibilities: (*a*) that Jesus was referring to Himself, but not in a Messianic sense (*bar nasha* being the equivalent of the first personal pronoun); [3] or (*b*) that the reference was to 'man' in general. It does not matter greatly which of these alternatives is adopted; the important thing to realize is that the contrast drawn by Jesus was one between blasphemy against the human and blasphemy against the Divine. The Markan form of the saying, in spite of the development which it has undergone, preserves this essential contrast. The Greek version of Q, on the other hand, whilst preserving the original *form* of the saying, has obscured its *meaning* by an over-literal rendering of the expression *bar nasha*. We conclude, accordingly, that what Jesus actually said, and meant, was something like the following:

Every one who shall blaspheme against a man will be forgiven;
But he that blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven.

II

Can we, however, place this utterance of our Lord in its original context? In Mark it appears as the conclusion of Jesus' reply to the charges brought against Him by the Scribes ('He hath Beelzebul, and, By the prince of the devils casteth he out the devils' [Mk 3^{22}]); Mark emphasizes the connexion between the saying and the Beelzebul controversy by adding, in *v.* 30, the explanatory comment 'because they said, He hath an unclean spirit.' Matthew's account of the Beelzebul controversy (Mt $12^{24ff.}$), like its version of the saying on the unforgivable sin, represents a conflation of Mark and Q, but Matthew follows Mark in introducing the saying at this point. The Q version of the Beelzebul controversy, however—as represented by Lk 11^{15-23}—does not include the saying; in Q it appears in a different context, namely in a group of sayings (Lk 12^{8-12}) which includes the saying on confessing and denying Jesus (*vv.* 8 f.) and that on the Holy Spirit's guidance when the disciples are brought before synagogues, etc. (*vv.* 11 f.). We must inquire, therefore, whether Mark or Q has preserved the saying in its original context.

It seems probable that the arrangement of the sayings in Lk 12^{8-12} was made on a topical, rather than on a historical basis. Such an arrangement of sayings would be quite natural to a document such as Q. The compiler no doubt felt that a reference to the unforgivableness of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit was fitting after a saying which says that he who denies Christ will be denied in the Judgment; [4] further, he may well have felt

[1] In this second half of the saying, there is a progressive 'strengthening' from Q to Mark and from Mark to Matthew (with its 'neither in this world, nor in that which is to come').

[2] Cf. T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 110. He describes the situation (if the Q saying refers to blasphemies against the Son of Man) as 'impossible.'

[3] See A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 44 f.

[4] The saying in *v.* 10, as originally intended (see above), is not inconsistent with that of *vv.* 8 f. It was only when the Greek version of Q mistakenly rendered *bar nasha* as 'Son of Man' that the inconsistency arose. Luke may, or may not, have been aware of the inconsistency; in any case he has, according to custom, reproduced his source closely and faithfully.

that the saying on blaspheming the Holy Spirit was relevant to the situation envisaged in the following saying (when their opponents bring slanderous charges against the disciples, they are not merely blaspheming against men, but blaspheming against the Holy Spirit, for it is He who speaks, and works, in the disciples, as in their Master).[1] If the arrangement of the sayings in Q was governed by such topical considerations, we learn nothing from that document as to the occasion on which our saying was actually spoken.

Do we fare any better when we turn to Mark? Most commentators have accepted the Markan context of the saying as original, regarding it as the conclusion of Jesus' reply to the Beelzebul charge. Vincent Taylor, however, considers that Mk 3^{22-26} was originally a unit in itself (a ' pronouncement-story '), and that 3^{27} (the saying on the strong man) and $3^{28f.}$ (the saying on the unforgivable sin) were separate sayings taken from an early collection and attached thereto.[2] So far as the saying on the unforgivable sin is concerned, this view is borne out by the fact that the saying is wanting in the Q version of the Beelzebul controversy but appears in Q in a different context (by contrast, the saying on the strong man occurs in the Beelzebul context in both Mark and Q). We cannot then claim with any confidence that Jesus referred to the unforgivable sin on the actual occasion of His reply to the 'Beelzebul' charge brought against Him by the Scribes.

Thus we seem to be left with an isolated saying of Jesus, the genuineness of which (in view of the joint testimony of Mark and Q) there is no reason to doubt, but the original occasion of whose utterance we cannot precisely determine. Fortunately, however, this does not mean that we are entirely without any means of determining the *kind* of situation which gave rise to the saying. For there are indications, as V. Taylor has shown,[3] that Mk 3^{19b-35} represents a complex of narratives and sayings which was already in existence before Mark wrote his Gospel. This complex illustrates the general theme of charges brought against Jesus. Thus we have evidence that from an early date the saying about the unforgivable sin was quoted in connexion with the theme of the charges to which Jesus was exposed during His ministry, and the way in which He replied to them. Is it not reasonable to suppose that this connexion was due to the recollection that Jesus had actually spoken the words in just such a situation? It is true that the compiler of Q used the saying in rather a different way. And yet, if the explanation offered above of the motives which led him to insert the saying where he did is sound, the difference is not so great after all. A warning originally uttered by Jesus to those who laid blasphemous charges against Himself as He worked by the power of the Holy Spirit could very naturally be quoted as a warning to those who laid similar charges against the disciples when they too worked by the power of the same Spirit.

Whilst, then, having to admit that we cannot place the saying about the unforgivable sin in the precise historical context in which it was originally uttered, we may claim that there is every reason to believe that its terrible warning was drawn from the lips of Jesus by the charges brought against Him by those who refused to recognize that, in His words and deeds, the Holy Spirit was manifestly at work. We may accordingly accept Taylor's conclusion that ' Mark has rightly divined, or was guided by good tradition, in connecting it [the saying] with the charge of possession by Beelzebul.'[4]

III

In our attempt to interpret the meaning of the saying under discussion, the two questions to be considered are: (i) Did Jesus teach that there is such a thing as unforgivable sin, *i.e.*, sin of such an order that the possibility of Divine forgiveness is absolutely and for ever precluded? (ii) If He did so teach, what is the character of the sin in question?

(i) In connexion with the former of these questions, we may note first the opinion of those commentators, such as A. H. McNeile, who claim that Jesus ' meant, and would be understood to mean, no more than that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, by whose power He worked, was a terrible sin—more terrible than blasphemy against man.'[5] This interpretation is based upon the view that Jesus' language reflects a Jewish ' custom of securing emphasis by means of some form of overstatement or hyperbole.'[6] McNeile claims that ' in Jewish phraseology serious sin was often spoken of as unpardonable,' and cites Nu $15^{30f.}$, 1 S 3^{14} and Is 22^{14} as examples.[7] This appeal to Jewish habits of speech, and to the Old Testament passages in particular, is, however, a precarious one; the fact that ' serious sin was often spoken of as

[1] Cf. T. W. Manson, *op. cit.*, 110.

[2] See *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 240 f. Taylor also believes that the sayings of Lk 11^{19-26} are sayings which were attached, in Q, to the original unit of $11^{14f. 17f.}$ (*op. cit.*, 237).

[3] *Op. cit.*, 92 f., 235; cf. T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 85.

[4] *Op. cit.*, 241.

[5] A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 179.

[6] See C. J. Cadoux, *The Historic Mission of Jesus*, 202 n., 213.

[7] *Op. cit.*, 179.

unpardonable' does not prove that sin was never, in any circumstances, actually regarded as being unpardonable—and it is possible that some at least of the passages cited by McNeile mean literally what they say. Moreover, this treatment of 'will not be forgiven' as a mere hyperbolic expression hardly does justice to the sharp contrast implied between the two members of the parallelism. It is difficult to avoid the impression that this whittling down of the force of the saying is a rather desperate expedient, to be approached with caution, and adopted only if the plain meaning of Jesus' words proves quite incapable of reasonable exegesis in the light of His teaching as a whole.

It goes without saying that no interpretation of the saying can be acceptable that is out of harmony with the general tenor of Jesus' teaching on the subject of sin and forgiveness; the single saying in which He speaks of sin for which no forgiveness is possible must clearly be interpreted in the light of His general attitude to the question of Divine forgiveness. The attitude of the father in the Parable of the Prodigal Son (Lk 15^{11-32}) is sufficient proof that Jesus thought of God as ever graciously ready, and anxious, to forgive the sins of men. If, therefore, He held that there is such a thing as unforgivable sin, we may be sure that He regarded the impossibility of its forgiveness as being due, not to God's unwillingness to grant, but to the sinner's incapacity to receive the forgiveness. That repentance is the prerequisite of receiving forgiveness is everywhere apparent in the teaching of Jesus.[1] He also teaches that a sinner's being forgiven by God is conditional upon his showing a forgiving spirit towards those who have wronged him.[2] This, however, is not really a second condition, since the willingness to forgive others is a natural accompaniment of genuine repentance for one's own sins; the absence of the forgiving spirit reveals that a man is not truly penitent. Thus we may say that for Jesus the sole condition upon which Divine forgiveness may be received is genuine repentance on the part of the sinner. And this means that the possibility of forgiveness can only be entirely ruled out if and when the sinner reaches a state in which he is no longer capable of repenting.

Thus the question as to whether there is such a thing as unforgivable sin now becomes a question as to whether such a state of incapacity to repent is possible for a sinner. The idea that it is possible is found in Rabbinic Judaism, as is instanced in the saying 'He who is wholly given up to sin is unable to repent, and there is no forgiveness to him for ever.'[3] The same idea appears in the New Testament: (*a*) in He 6^{4-6}, which says of those who deliberately become apostates from the Christian Faith that 'it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance'[4]; and (*b*) in 1 Jn 5^{16}, which asserts that 'there is a sin unto death,' for the forgiveness of which no prayer can avail.[5] If the saying on the unforgivable sin (in the simple, parallelistic form indicated above) is a genuine utterance of Jesus, the most natural way of interpreting it—and one that is in harmony with His teaching on forgiveness in general—is to treat it as indicating that He, too, envisaged the possibility of a sinner reaching a state of incapacity to repent, and so to receive the forgiveness of God.

(ii) It remains to inquire what is the character of this sin with regard to which the possibility of repentance and forgiveness is precluded. Jesus expressly defines it as blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. In the absence of any precise information as to the nature of the situation which gave rise to the saying—and in the absence, too, of any other reference on His part to such blasphemy—we cannot be absolutely certain as to exactly what is involved in this 'blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.' Nevertheless, if (as we have seen reason to believe) the words of Jesus regarding it were spoken in the context of the charges brought against Him of being in league with, or possessed by, evil spirits, we may infer that the sin in question has to do with the ascription to evil powers of those works which are manifestly the activity of the Spirit.

It would hardly seem, however, that to ascribe the work of the Spirit to evil agencies on one particular occasion is necessarily to commit the unforgivable sin. It is significant that Jesus does not, within the compass of the Beelzebul controversy as such (Mk 3^{28-30}, as we have seen, not being part of Jesus' actual reply to the Scribes *on that occasion*), accuse His opponents of having committed it. On the contrary, He reasons with them in a manner which suggests that He recognized at least the possibility of their being led to see the error of their ways—and so, presumably, to repent.

[1] This is clearly stated in Lk 17^{3-4}, and is implied in many other sayings on the necessity for repentance. See V. Taylor, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation*, 13 f.

[2] See Mk 11^{25}, Mt 6^{12} (=Lk 11^{4}) $6^{14f.}$ 18^{22-35}.

[3] *Midrash Tehillim on Ps.* 1, quoted by J. Moffatt, *Hebrews* [*I.C.C.*], 77, where other evidence is also cited. See also I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, 1st ser., 142 f.

[4] Cf. He $12^{16f.}$, where Esau is cited as an example of a sinner who 'found no place of repentance.'

[5] The nature of the sin in question is not specified, but the implication is that it is a sin for which repentance is not possible. This is the more likely in view of the author's earlier assertion, in 1^{9}, that 'if we confess our sins' (*i.e.*, repent), God 'is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins.'

And where repentance remains possible, the sin, however heinous, cannot, as we have seen, be regarded as unforgivable. It may be possible, then, to repent of, and receive forgiveness for, particular instances of the sin of ascribing to evil powers the work of the Spirit. Nevertheless, it is obvious that each time a person commits this sin, he places himself in moral danger of ever-increasing gravity. For to call good evil in this way is deliberately to pervert all moral values, and to persist in such an attitude can only result in a progressive blunting of moral sensibility, the ultimate conclusion of which will be to become so hardened in sin as to lose for ever the capacity to recognize the value of goodness and to be attracted by it. To reach such a state is to be incapable of repentance ; the sinner has shut himself out, irrevocably and eternally, from the forgiving mercy of God. The most convincing explanation of our Lord's saying about the unforgivable sin is that He spoke it as a solemn warning to His opponents against the inevitable and terrible consequences that would overtake them if they persisted in their sin.

It is this solemn reminder that it contains of the awful consequences of persisting in sin, and of defiantly refusing to acknowledge the value of goodness, that makes the saying one of abiding relevance and importance. If, however, those who persist in sinning ' with an high hand,' in defiance of their own moral sense, need constantly to be reminded of our Lord's solemn warning, those others whose too sensitive consciences lead them to fear that they have committed the unforgivable sin need no less to be reminded that the very distress which they feel is the clearest possible evidence that they have not in fact committed it.

Recent Foreign Theology

Festgabe for Karl Barth. Amongst the many tributes to Karl Barth on his seventieth birthday one which must have pleased him greatly consists of two special issues of the *Theologische Zeitschrift*.[1] Each is a much enlarged issue, and the first contains essays by his colleagues in the Theological Faculty of Basel, while the second contains articles by a number of younger Swiss theologians. In the first part there are important articles on the Old Testament by W. Eichrodt and on the New by Oscar Cullmann and Bo Reicke, while E. Staehelin contributes an article on Barth's predecessors in the Chair of Systematic Theology at Basel. It is of interest to note that de Wette was one of these, and also Schenkel, who edited a Bibel-lexikon which was widely used a century ago, while J. Wendland was Barth's immediate predecessor. H. van Oyen and F. Buri offer studies in the field of the philosophy and psychology of religion, while J. Schweizer has a study in the field of ecclesiastical history, concerned with the time of Zwingli. To outline all of these articles would be impossible here. Cullmann's treatment of immortality and resurrection in the New Testament, leading to the conclusion that the Socratic or Platonic idea of the immortality of the soul is not found in the New Testament at all, was of particular interest to the reviewer.

The second part of this *Festgabe* contains articles on the Old Testament by E. Jenni and on the New by H. Bietenhard and R. Morgenthaler, on worship by M. Rissi, on theology and philosophy by L. Vischer, M. A. Schmidt, and E. Buess, a study of the pietists J. W. and J. E. Petersen by K. Lüthi, one on love and death in Mozart's life and work by W. Bieder, a historical study on Roxandra Scarlatovna von Stourdza by M. Geiger, and finally one on the sovereignty of God in the teaching of Karl Barth by H. Ott. Amongst this varied fare the reviewer found most interest in Jenni's study of some aspects of the teaching of Judges and Buess's on predestination in Calvin's *Institutio*. The two parts form a worthy tribute to a distinguished theologian and offer solid contributions to theological learning.

[1] *Theologische Zeitschrift*, Parts 3 and 4 [March-April and May-June 1956]. Reinhardt, Basel ; Fr. 7·50 each part.

The Books of Samuel. In the series of Dutch Catholic Commentaries on the Old Testament a new volume has appeared,[2] from the pen of Dr. A. van den Born, one of the editors of the series. This is devoted to the Books of Samuel, and like all the volumes of the series it contains an original translation of the Hebrew text, with careful verse by verse notes standing below. There is a brief Introduction, in which the many duplications found in these books are ascribed to a variety of separate traditions which were brought together by the author *c.* 600 B.C. Van den Born is probably right in rejecting a two-source theory of the origin of the book, but since many of the duplications have links which bind them together, it is likely that there were written sources, and too much fragmentizing of the traditions is to be deprecated. The continuous section 2 S 9–20 is

[2] *Samuël uit de grondtekst vertaald en uitgelegd* [1956]. Romen en Zonen, Roermond en Maaseik ; Fl. 9.86 ; by subscription Fl. 8.70.

ecognized to be extracted from a literary source, ontinued in the opening chapters of 1 Kings, and ther sources, though probably more than two in umber, may have been similarly drawn on. The iew of A. R. S. Kennedy, who is unmentioned nongst the commentators in the bibliography ere, has always seemed to me to be probably very ar the truth. The margin of divergence from hat of van den Born is less considerable than the greement. Throughout the commentary sound nolarship and balanced judgment are shown. he textual changes adopted are listed together t the end of the volume.

The Mari Excavations. Much has been published bout the excavations conducted at Tell Hariri, he ancient Mari, under the leadership of Professor ndré Parrot, and many of the texts found there ave been made available in transcription and ranslation. Professor Parrot has now issued the rst volume of the official record of the excavation,[1] nd like so many of the volumes of this kind, it is andsomely produced and profusely illustrated. It s concerned with the Temple of Ishtar, and it escribes the various levels revealed in the course f the dig, and all the material finds which came o light there. Of their abundance and variety he seventy-two pages of plates at the end of the olume, in addition to the many illustrations interpersed in the text, give full evidence. Mari is ne of the most sensational of the archaeological ediscoveries of recent years, and its archives have dded greatly to our knowledge of the ancient Near East in the second millennium B.C., and this nd the succeeding volumes will unfold the story f that rediscovery.

Proverbs in the Septuagint. After an interval of en years, Professor G. Gerleman has published the hird of his *Studies in the Septuagint*, dealing with he Book of Proverbs.[2] He writes in English, and ffers in compact form the fruits of much careful esearch. He rejects the view that the translator as dependent on extra-Israelite Oriental wisdom, ut thinks he was acquainted with Greek thought. He thinks the translation dates from a time when Old Testament piety and Greek philosophy were irst coming into opposition, and suggests the niddle of the second century B.C. He examines he translator's attempts to reproduce some lements of the style of the original, and traces nany of the striking variations between the Hebrew and the Greek to the translators' desire to avoid repetitions and metaphors which would seem inelegant to a Greek reader. A short appendix is devoted to the Sahidic translation. This slender volume is a valuable addition to the literature on the Septuagint, marked by caution in judgment and by wide learning.

The Millennium. Dr. Hans Bietenhard, of the University of Berne, has made a careful study of the Biblical teaching on the millennium, in relation to extra-Biblical thought.[3] He starts from Rev 19^{11}–20^{10}, which he studies in detail, both in itself and in the setting of the whole Apocalypse, and then passes back to the Old Testament and Jewish background of the idea, including such passages as the Gog and Magog passage in the Book of Ezekiel. The question of the double resurrection is examined, and later Jewish parallels are adduced, and the conception is interpreted in the light of passages from the Pauline epistles. The Christian hope of the Parousia and the thought of the Lordship of Christ and of the saints in the millennium receive attention, and the book closes with a short survey of the teaching on the millennium in modern theology, and especially in the work of Paul Althaus. The whole study is a careful and scholarly piece of work, far removed from the class of book which endeavours to calculate when the millennium may be expected. Beneath all the variety of details of the form in which the idea of the millennial reign appears is the underlying thought of a climax of history, in which evil will be swallowed up and the will of God be perfectly done.

Samaria. In Professor Parrot's excellent series of *Cahiers d'Archéologie Biblique*, previous numbers of which have been noted in these columns, a very useful volume is devoted to Samaria.[4] It reviews the history of the northern kingdom, and then offers an account of all that archaeology has brought to light concerning Samaria right down to Hellenistic and Roman times. There are good illustrations and maps, and the work is well documented throughout. Professor Parrot is an archaeologist of the highest repute, who is well known as the distinguished excavator of the ancient Mari, and also a good Biblical scholar, who is well acquainted with modern work on the Old Testament. The general reader, for whom this little series is written, could not have better guidance.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester University.

[1] *Mission archéologique de Mari*, I: *Le Temple d'Ishtar* [1956]. Paul Geuthner, Paris.

[2] *Studies in the Septuagint*, III: *Proverbs* [1956]. Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N.F. Avd. 1, Bd. 52, Nr. 3. Gleerup, Lund; Sw. Kr.: 6.50.

[3] *Das tausendjährige Reich* [1955]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich; Fr. 14.50.

[4] *Samarie, capitale du royaume d'Israël* [1955]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchatel and Paris.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Black Ants and White Ants

By the Reverend William Whittle, Oldbury, Birmingham

If you go to Ghana, which we used to know as the Gold Coast, you will soon make the acquaintance of ants, spiders and other creepy things in many colours and sizes. But the ants are really wonderful. Actually the so-called black ants are a rich dark brown and shiny, often known as 'driver' ants. They move along in great numbers and when they travel through the forest they form a long procession about the width of a broad ribbon. When they come to an open space they may spread out searching for food. I once saw a thrilling fight to the death between a crowd of driver ants and a big scorpion. The ants won and consumed all the edible parts of their enemy. When I have been trekking through the bush I have often seen them crossing the path in thin bands. As I stood over them they made no attempt to touch me but when I drew my foot sharply across their track, they immediately broke their ranks and ran about in all directions searching for the foe. I had to stamp my feet hard or they would have been on to my boots and up to my bare knees and their bite would be like the vicious prick of a needle.

The white ants are not at all nice. They are really termites and are soft, flabby creatures. They are not in fact white, but rather a dirty grey. And they won't come out into the open. They love the darkness rather than the light. And they work secretly. They like to burrow into wood and if it happens to be a piece of furniture that has been standing in the same place for some time, they will eat the inner part, and then one day the whole thing collapses. One day I unpacked a box of tinned and bottled food. It had been standing in a room for some weeks and the white ants had got into it and had eaten off all the labels! The ants were there in their hundreds; writhing and twisting in the bottom of the box, disturbed by the unaccustomed light. I knew how to deal with them. It was mid-day and the sun was beating down fiercely upon the concrete covered compound, making it unbearably hot to the touch. Taking the box out into the compound I suddenly tipped it up and all the ants tumbled out on to the hot concrete. For a second they ran in all directions and then they stopped dead in their tracks—really dead. They could not stand the exposure to the blinding light of the sun and its fierce heat.

There are some evil things we must fight against but which, like the driver ants, we can see and we know what to do about them. Things like strong drink and gambling. But there are others, like the white ants which move in the darkness, invisible but all the time they are doing their destructive work. I mean things like lying, and deceit, dishonesty and jealousy. What you must do is to bring them out into the open, force them into the light, expose them and see them for what they are. They cannot stand the light; and by the light, I mean the light that shines from the face of Jesus when we have taken Him into our hearts.

The Powerful Wind

By the Reverend A. Whigham Price, M.A., Gateshead

'Strengthened with might by his Spirit.'—Eph 3^{16}.

One day last summer we went to some woods not far from our home for a picnic. These woods extend over several miles, in a valley, and through the middle of the trees there flows a little stream—slow-moving and deep in some places, very fast and shallow in others, as is the way of rivers. We had fun making little boats out of some broken bits of bark which we found on the bank; we made a tiny hole in the middle, put in (or 'stepped,' as sailors say) a mast cut from a twig, and fixed on a paper sail by cutting two holes in a toffee paper and threading it through the mast. Then we found a bit of the river where the stream was flowing very fast over some smooth shelving rock, and launched the boats, to have a race. We noticed that there was a gentle breeze blowing, but it didn't seem very strong; indeed, it was so slight that we didn't even notice the direction from which it was coming. But what was our astonishment to find, after we had launched the boats, that at once they began to sail vigorously *up-stream*. Strong though the force of the river was, something else, it appeared, was a good deal stronger—the wind. We could see big logs that were being swept down-stream by the powerful current; but our little ships, just because they had a tiny sail, about two inches square, were sweeping majestically the other way, *against* the stream. How surprised we were!

To-day is Whitsunday—the time when the Church celebrates the coming of the Holy Spirit.

You will remember how the disciples struggled to describe what had happened to them, how they said, 'Well, it was sort of like the wind, you know—invisible, but terribly powerful.' They had received a new power from outside themselves. And when we receive this power we find that we can conquer difficulties that were impossible before, just as the little boats were swept along by a wind stronger than the fast-moving current.

Let us ask God to give us this gift of His Holy Spirit to-day. Then we shall be surprised at what we are able to do for Him—against temptation, against difficulties, against discouragement. 'If God be for us, who can be against us?' For we shall be 'strengthened with might by his Spirit.'

The Christian Year

ROGATION SUNDAY

Asking the Right Questions

BY THE REVEREND EDWARD ROGERS, M.A., B.D., LONDON

'Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss.'—Ja 4^3.

At Rogation-tide our thoughts are particularly and specially turned towards petition. The days of Rogation were days in which urgent prayers were offered to particular saints, beseeching their intermediary aid with God in the affairs of this mortal life that came under their peculiar care. I shall, however, be taking it for granted that it is a good thing to make our requests known, with prayers and supplications, unto Almighty God. I want to consider one of the very real difficulties about our petitions. Why are they so often unanswered?

It is not good enough to brush aside the question as a dreadful sign of unbelief. Many Christians have poured out their souls in earnest prayer and yet have not received those things for which they so sincerely prayed. The promise of our Lord: 'Ask, and ye shall receive,' seems continually to have been contradicted in our own experience.

It is, of course, easy to understand that the type of petition condemned by James is not likely to be answered. A selfish request for more money or more power in order that we might indulge in wanton self-gratification, or an angry demand that our enemies and rivals should be smitten by some loathsome disease, would not commend itself to the God of Holy Love. And there are times when, for our own good, the things we seek are withheld from us. If a small child asks for a birthday tea consisting exclusively of liquorice all-sorts, ice-cream and coca-cola, a sensible and loving parent is not likely to consent, although the horrid meal might seem to the child the last word in dietetic magnificence and eminently suitable for a birthday. So it is at times with us. We ask, quite sincerely, for the wrong things. How often, for instance, have we asked for some frightening difficulty to be moved from our way, and only afterwards discovered that it was His will that by meeting and overcoming it with His aid we should be strengthened in character.

Sometimes we ask for the wrong things because we make the wrong choices, and we choose wrong because our vision is too narrowly blinkered. We think in terms of this life and this world. Though we ought to know better, the fear of death is still strong upon us, and we pray as though death were a final thing to God also. The omniscience that spans eternity sees more clearly and more wisely.

But I think that there is another and a deeper reason. Our converse with God is a two-way traffic. Perhaps we ask amiss because we have not learned how to ask the right preliminary questions. In the things of our own world, which is also part of God's kingdom and congruous with the rest, every sure advance in knowledge has come only when the right questions were asked. Physicists were baffled for years by the 'fact' that though atoms were indivisible, there appeared to be persistent and inexplicable variations in the atomic weights of otherwise identical atoms. They put it down to experimental errors that repeated themselves despite every precaution. They did not begin to get the glimmering of an answer until they asked the right question: Is it true that the atom is indivisible?

Not all the religious leaders in Palestine nineteen centuries ago were cunning and unscrupulous careerists. Many, both Pharisees and Sadducees, were honourable and upright men. They searched the Scriptures daily to find and obey the will of God. But they asked the wrong questions. They knew that God was altogether righteous. They knew that a sinner could not stand before Him. They knew, therefore, that all sinners would be destroyed in the day of the coming of the Lord. The question they debated concerned the number that would be left alive at His coming—and because Jesus made Himself a friend of sinners they drew the inevitable conclusion that He was a blasphemous enemy of God, and crucified Him. If only they had not been so sure that they knew all there was to know about the nature and purpose of God! If only they had asked the right question: If God is righteous and a sinner cannot stand before Him, and yet if God is love, how can a sinner be changed? They might then have recognized the way of conversion, and seen God's answer in Jesus.

The importance of asking the right questions

cannot be over-estimated. Let me quote two examples which regularly are put to me because of the particular range of concerns under my care. 'Is it right to play cricket on Sunday?' is always cropping up. As it stands, baldly and without context, it is unanswerable. If the game is wrong in itself, it is wrong on any day of the week. If it is a fit and proper pastime, then what harm is there in Sunday play? The dilemma exists only, of course, for those who believe that the Lord's Day is a distinctive day, but for them the very existence of the dilemma makes them suspect that they are being irrational or custom-bound in their attitude. The trouble is that they have started with a superficial and secondary question. They ought to be asking: 'Given this day of rest and worship in addition to all the other opportunities of the week for leisure, how can I best allot my time and how best use this day?' The answer to that is straightforward enough.

A much more serious question, which has divided convinced and conscientious Christians for centuries and still divides them, is the Christian attitude to war. 'Should a Christian, in any circumstances, bear arms and be prepared to kill?' Each of us has his own considered opinion, but not one of us can say that his opinion is *the* Christian answer. Too many, whose integrity we respect, differ from us. I suggest that the lesson to be drawn from the dilemma is that we are concentrating on the wrong target. Should we be wiser and humbler to ask instead, to ask ourselves and God, 'How can we prevent war and build up a positive and creative peace?'

The truth appears to be that behind many of our ineffective petitions are ultimately unanswerable questions; unanswerable because they are both loaded and unreal. They are loaded with presuppositions and imaginative distortions of reality. There is no place for the rhetorical question in the meeting of man and God, for all that then comes back to us is the echo of our own limited assumption.

We must seek with desperate determination after truth, ready to follow wherever it leads. We must learn humility, and cease to instruct God as though He were no more than the executive manager of a company we owned. The subtle, hidden pride from which the rhetorical question grows is deeply rooted in us. The fact is, to change the metaphor and to come still nearer to the truth, that we shall only see clearly enough to ask sensibly when the beam has been removed from our eyes. And that does not come by training or self-imposed discipline. It comes only when a man pleads, earnestly, passionately, resolutely, determined to be answered: 'What shall I do to be saved?'

Sunday After Ascension

God's Purposes are Greater than Ours

By the Reverend Roderick Bethune, M.A., Edinburgh

'7.' And it came to pass after a while, that the brook dried up, because there had been no rain in the land.' —1 K 17[7].

It was in obedience to the express command of God that Elijah made his way to the brook Cherith. For a time all went well. Given an adequate supply of bread and water, the prophet had nothing of which to complain. Then the unexpected happened. The waters of the brook began to fall. Day by day they grew less and less until, finally, they dried up. In all likelihood the prophet was both surprised and puzzled. Why should that upon which he came to lean, without which he just could not figure life, be taken from him?

All the evidence points to the fact that Elijah was being trained to fulfil a highly important mission. The disappearance of the brook, so inexplicable to Elijah, had, there can be no doubt, its definite place in the training he had to undergo and signified a desire on God's part, not that Elijah's life should be something less than it had been, but something infinitely greater.

1. At first and for some time after his arrival at the brook Cherith Elijah realized that he owed the preservation of his life to God who had ordained the means of subsistence. As time passed, however, the ravens and the brook may well have obscured rather than revealed God. They, and not God from whom they came, may well have filled the prophet's mind.

Such a state of things could not be allowed to continue. The prophet must be taught, by the apparently drastic and cruel step of cutting off his supplies, that every good and perfect gift cometh down from above. Only when such a lesson had been learned could he be said to see life whole, and only as he saw life whole could he be said to be a man worthy of the name and capable of becoming a power for good in the lives of others.

Now, I am fully aware that it is always unwise, and not a little unfair, to generalize. For that reason I am not going to suggest that every one from whom something or some one they cherished has been taken has had need to learn the lesson which Elijah was so forcibly taught. Many such accepted the blessings of life as gifts from the good hand of God and daily returned thanks to Him who daily loadeth us all with benefits. The very recollection of such must caution one against offering a glib solution to the problem of suffering.

But there are some, I think it *is* fair to suggest, who allow the blessings of life to obscure rather than reveal God, men and women who, as they increase their possessions, acquire a greater reputation, exercise a wider influence, are exempted from the ills which afflict so many of their fellows, are found less and less frequently in the company of those who acknowledge that all that they are and have they owe to God. Was it not such people that John Donne had in mind when, in one of his poems, he said,

> From needing danger to be good,
> Deliver us, O Lord ?

He suggests, at least, that he had seen men who were prepared to turn to God in the day of adversity but who forgot Him when adversity was replaced by prosperity. And such conduct seemed to him, as in our better moments it seems to us, wholly unworthy.

But, unworthy as it is, it characterizes many in greater or less degree. That they may see life whole, the step which had to be taken in Elijah's case may have to be taken in their case also. The blessing is sometimes withdrawn—but it is withdrawn, not purposelessly that life may be something less than it has been, but meaningfully that life may be something infinitely greater.

2. It is interesting to note, however, that if the removal of the brook was intended to open the prophet's eyes to the God whom he may have suffered the brook to obscure, it was intended to deepen his experience both of life and of God.

He was instructed to proceed to the home of a widow at Zarephath. Arrived there, he discovered the distraught woman, because of the widespread famine in the land, preparing what she had every reason to believe would be the last meal she would eat. Elijah was now compelled, not only to mix and sympathize with all who stood in need, but, casting himself utterly and completely upon God, to endeavour to deliver them from their distresses.

How easy it is for all of us, rich in possessions and as rich in respect of friends, to live within our own little world and to forget those who are not so fortunately placed as we are ! Many of us seldom think of those from whom health and happiness have been withdrawn until these very blessings are withdrawn from ourselves. Our experience of life needs to be widened, our sympathy deepened, and sometimes that can be accomplished only as the step taken in the case of Elijah is taken in our case.

But this necessary enrichment of experience, this necessary discovery of new truth about life and about God, is not confined to those who suffer some temporary loss of health. Indeed, to confine the lessons of this part of Elijah's training to one constituency would be a tragic mistake. One thinks of some who have lost, not their health, but the faith in which they were nurtured. Such an experience, if it is not handled aright, can easily lead to cynicism and unbelief. But if the experience compels a man to think things through, it may, almost assuredly will, lead to his possessing a certitude he did not possess before. So, he tells us in his autobiography, did it happen in the case of the late Principal D. S. Cairns who, while a student in Edinburgh, felt, on one memorable night, that everything he had once held was no longer tenable. It seemed the most terrible event ever to befall him. But in other ways it was one of the greatest, for he emerged from the experience more certain than he had ever been and more capable of assuring others.

3. But if the removal of the brook was intended to deepen the prophet's sympathy with his fellows and to enlarge his knowledge of God, may we not say that it was intended to open his eyes to the greater purposes which God had in mind for him ?

Don't let us forget that this prophet who, as he looked upon the dry stones over which a brook once flowed, felt that life could not be what it once was, was a little later contending with four hundred prophets of Baal single-handed. His stay at Cherith had no doubt been pleasant. But God had other things in mind, greater things in mind, for which Cherith was only a preparation.

That same God, so the Bible tells us, has great purposes for all of us. But how often do we allow ourselves to forget or to ignore them by our concentration upon things which are material and temporary. Life, instead of being an adventure, becomes a dreary struggle to earn a livelihood. We might give our aid to one of many good causes, spend ourselves in the service of many needful people, but Cherith proves too strong an attraction. Is that not what constrained our Lord to say that we must lose what we think is life before we can find what really is life ?

The experience which befell Elijah has befallen many since. Something or some one very precious has been withdrawn. If we are of that company, may the experience mean for us what it meant for the prophet—that, as a result of it, we see life whole, have our understanding deepened and our faith in God confirmed.

WHITSUNDAY

The Communion of the Holy Spirit

BY PRINCIPAL H. F. LOVELL COCKS, D.D., BRISTOL

' The communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all.' —2 Co 13^{14}.

The *communion* of the Holy Spirit—thus the Authorised Version. The Revised Standard

Version has altered *communion* to *fellowship*—which is a pity. 'Fellowship' has by now become all too weak a word to carry the weight and wealth of the Greek word *koinonia*, which Paul is using here. Our church calendars are stiff with fellowships of all kinds. Men's Fellowships, Women's Fellowships, Young People's Fellowships—there are so many of them that we are in danger of forgetting that the fellowship of fellowships is the Church itself. Or may it not be that it is precisely because the Church as we know it is not obviously and beyond all doubt the fellowship of the Holy Spirit that we find it so necessary to multiply fellowships within it?

There is no single English word that does justice to the richness of *koinonia*, but perhaps 'sharing' takes us nearest to the root-idea it expresses. The Church is a community—a 'sharing'—which the Holy Spirit creates and sustains.

1. *The Church is a community whose members share in the life of God Himself.* 'Our fellowship,' says John in his First Epistle, 'is with the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ.' God has created us in order that He may give us a share in the glory and blessedness of His own Divine life. It is true that we men have failed to understand this, and in our foolishness we have sought to satisfy our natures with the creatures rather than the Creator. We have preferred the lesser to the greater good. Dazzled by the glitter, we have missed the gold. But when God in Christ brings us home from our wanderings and reconciles us to Himself, He gives us that share in His life and love for which He created us. Even while we are still in the midst of earth's turmoil and tribulation He gives us a foretaste of heaven. He makes us members of His Church. For the Church is the society of men and women who live in the Spirit and through the Spirit have communion with the Father and His Son, Jesus Christ.

Does this seem very remote and unrealistic? As we think of the churches we know best, must we not sadly confess that between our theory and our practice, between our theology and our religion, there is only too often a wide gulf fixed? Yet at the heart of our worship is that service, which we call 'Holy Communion,' to remind us that in spite of all our faithlessness and failings our Lord is indeed in the midst of His Church, offering to our faith His own body and blood which He gave for the life of the world. The church that is no more than a rather superior social club, or at best a society for cultivating the 'spiritual interests' of its members, is a church in name only. However undistinguished its outward appearance, however humble the very ordinary men and women who compose it, the Church of Christ is a fellowship in which heaven and earth meet and intermingle. The well-spring of its life is the lovingkindness of God the Father revealed to us in Christ, and revitalizing us through the Holy Spirit. The Christian fellowship has no life in itself. It lives only as it shares the eternal life of God. 'I am the vine, ye are the branches.' It is to churches as well as to individual Christians that these words are spoken.

2. *The Church's members share with one another.* The Church is no mere collection of isolated individuals, each praying in his own little corner and immersed in his own private spiritual concerns. It is a community whose members have left behind loneliness and isolation, and share with one another the unsearchable riches of Christ.

It is the Holy Spirit who creates this fellowship of believers. No other power can do it. This kind of fellowship is not created by the bazaars we organize 'to keep the people together,' nor by the church debts we incur 'to give the people some, thing to work for.' Bazaars are pleasant functions, and we can get a lot of enjoyment out of the 'efforts' we get up for the Fabric Fund. These may often be not unworthy expressions of the communion of the Holy Spirit when the latter exists. But they cannot be a satisfactory substitute for it.

With the sharing of its members one with another in the common life and concerns of the Church, the supernatural glory of the communion of the Holy Spirit begins to be seen beyond its borders. 'How these Christians love one another!' said the pagans of the first century as they watched Christian charity at work among those who were living in the Spirit. That pagan world, with its fierce racial hatreds and its callous disregard of human life was receiving through the Christian Church an object lesson in a new way of living and a new kind of society. In the twentieth century the same lesson needs once again to be powerfully taught. It is not enough that men should hear the gospel of peace; they must see that gospel actually making peace. They must see men of warring races and classes truly reconciled and made one in Christ. You and I believe that what political and economic interests cannot do, the Holy Spirit can accomplish. But men must *see* the communion of the Holy Spirit; and they must see it in us and our churches.

3. *The Church is commissioned to share with all mankind.* According to the Acts of the Apostles, when the gospel of salvation was first preached to the Gentiles, some of the Judæan Christians were scandalized and indignant. If these people had had their way, Christianity would have continued to be a Jewish sect with a message of hope and comfort for the chosen people, but with nothing to say and nothing to offer to the great world

outside. But the Holy Spirit was too strong for these die-hards; and in the end He convinced them that what the Father had given and Christ had accomplished in His Cross and Resurrection was not for Jews alone, but for the benefit of the whole race of men. Indeed, their own calling as members of the Church, the New Israel, was that they might be ambassadors of the grace of God and missionaries of the Cross to all the world.

The mistake the Judæan Christians made is still being made to-day. In all too many churches there are those who enjoy the privileges and comforts of the fellowship without much thought or concern for those who are still outside. Such churches may be fellowships of a kind, but they do not share the communion of the Holy Spirit. Christ may be their titular Head, but He does not rule them. God means His Church to be, not a cistern, but a channel of grace. And all who really share the communion of the Holy Spirit will want to share it with their neighbours. 'Come, Holy Ghost, our hearts inspire.'

Trinity Sunday

The Truths the Trinity Safeguards

By the Reverend Robert Menzies, D.D., Glasgow

'Through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.'—Eph 2^{18}.

The doctrine of the Trinity is admittedly the most difficult of all Christian doctrines. When we remember the puzzle that our own nature is to ourselves, the mysterious deeps and heights that an analysis of ourselves brings to light, it is not surprising that any attempt to define the nature of God should present us with difficulties on an immeasurably greater scale. Martin Luther once wrote 'God in the perfection of His nature is beyond our power to fathom. He can only be known in the way He chooses to reveal Himself.' John the Evangelist said the same thing in so many words. 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.'

It should be carefully noted that the doctrine of the Trinity is not, and was never intended to be an exhaustive definition of the nature of God, but rather a description of His modes of manifestation in Christ Jesus. When the Christian Church reflected deeply on God's self-disclosure in Christ and tried to do justice to the richness and manifoldness of the experience the gospel brought them they found that they could formulate this experience in no other than a Trinitarian form. It was the pressure of experience working itself out in thought-forms that gave rise to this doctrine. It was designed to be a safeguard against false conceptions, or a corrective against limited views, of the nature of God. It was a doctrine formulated by the Church to conserve the great facts of Christian experience. Observe three great truths in particular it safeguards.

(1) It *safeguards our conception of God*. What is God like? The Trinitarian claim is that He is one yet diverse. He is personal yet social. He is not like the Greek Jupiter, one who dwells in some Olympian fastness remote from men and careless of their needs. He is not like the Muhammadan god, a kind of celestial Sultan, seated on an unshared throne, a kind of impersonal Fate issuing decrees against which there is no appeal. He is not like the Hindu gods who have no personal life of their own but are exhausted in the sum of their attributes. He is not like the God of the Unitarians, a bleak, bare, undivided unity. The Trinity reminds us that there is society in heaven. There are distinctions in the Godhead. There are the warmth and colour of reciprocal relations. The essence of God's nature is love, and the peculiarity of love is that it always craves for an object or objects on which to rest. So we have three Persons in the Godhead yet the three are One. This doctrine, however difficult it is to grasp intellectually, is peculiarly satisfying to the heart. The proof of this is that it is the doctrine of the Trinity and not Unitarianism that has secured the allegiance of mankind, although the latter is easier to grasp and understand.

(2) It *safeguards the uniqueness and supremacy of Christ*. It does justice to the spiritual impression He has made on mankind. Instinctively we feel that it is at this point that the Unitarian creed falls short of the truth. However high Unitarians exalt the character of Jesus, and many of them give Him a peerless ascendancy, yet He remains on our side of the line. He comes from beneath, is the product of our human nature, the crown of man's evolutionary development. This idea attracts many people but it completely fails to do justice to the gospel facts. Clearly there Jesus is much more than man. He exercises an authority over Nature, disease and death, which no man we have ever known does. It fails to do justice to His identity with His Father's will. It makes nonsense of a claim like this. 'No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. Come unto me. . . .' It fails to do justice to His ability to reconcile men to God, and create within man the new life of the Spirit. The Church was determined to make plain to themselves and others the unique experience of God He

had brought into their lives, and they could only account for it by saying that Jesus was from above not beneath. So He became in their experience the second Person in the Trinity, sharing God's throne. They called it the throne of God and the Lamb.

(3) Again the Trinity safeguards the truth that the work of *salvation is Divine from the beginning to the end.* In the task of saving men another influence is at work besides the activity of the Father and the Son. It is the Holy Spirit, the third Person in the Trinity. He proceeds from the Father and the Son yet is a distinct self-manifestation of God. The Spirit in the New Testament is always spoken of in a personal way, not as it but as He. We can speak to the Spirit, and can commune with Him. He can be grieved, resisted, quenched. Paul speaks of the love of the Spirit. His office is to dwell in our hearts and carry through the work of Divine redemption. Our text makes this plain. 'Through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.' What is it that is taking place when we are born again and renewed in heart and mind? Something like this is happening. We discover that a triple chain of influence is at work. We find that the source of our salvation is in God, in His saving will and purpose; that this salvation is made accessible to us through the Person and work of the historic Jesus; that it is made operative and effective through the indwelling Spirit. In other words, in the work of redemption we are acted upon by God in the threefoldness of His being. We are acted upon by God Transcendent, God Incarnate, God Immanent. This is our guarantee—and what a guarantee it is—that what God begins He will carry through. He will perfect that which concerneth Him in us.

The doctrine of the Trinity is, indeed, a great mystery but it lights up many other dark things. Although in itself it is hard to understand, it makes luminous other doctrines of the faith. The most helpful way to understand it is to approach it as the New Testament writers do and regard it, not as a creedal formulation nor as a speculative conundrum, but as an inference from Christian experience. If we begin with the fact of Christ and lay all the stress on that, the pressure of Christian experience will lead us to some such thought-form as this. As we reflect on the life of Christ we irresistibly reach the conclusion that God is our Father. As we think of His saving work in the Cross and Resurrection we know that God is our Redeemer. And as we examine our own hearts and note the change in ourselves the gospel produces we know that God is our Sanctifier. Through our experience of Christ we become aware of God Transcendent, our Father, acting above us, of God Incarnate, the Son acting for us, God Immanent, acting in us, the Spirit. Only such a God can meet our complex need. Let us then, not only as an act of worship but as a transcendent affirmation of our faith, ascribe to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, three Persons in one God, as is most justly due, the kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever.

First Sunday after Trinity

Is It Illusion or Inspiration?

By the Reverend Arthur A. Cowan, D.D., Edinburgh

'I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed: and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.'—1 Co 12[3].

People are influenced by what the neighbours say. The local Jewish synagogue was next door to the Christian meeting-place in Corinth, and some Corinthian Christians may have been demoralized by hearing members of the synagogue denying that Jesus was Divine and denouncing Him as a pretender who was anathema. That would affect the climate of opinion in the vicinity. Salomon Reinach, the French Jew, defined religion as 'a collection of scruples which impede the free exercise of our faculties,' and Bertrand Russell wrote a book entitled *Why I am Not a Christian,* in which he criticized, not only the character of Christian people, but also the character of Jesus Himself. The man next door may express such depreciations of the Christian faith, and companions in office or factory may so devalue our beliefs as to make us wonder at times if we have been mistaken in assessing Jesus Christ as the Son of God who is entitled to our total allegiance. Confidence in our Lord may be worn down by daily attrition, or by inability to answer all the challenging arguments.

It was to those whose Christian certainty was shaken that St. Paul wrote: 'I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed'; *i.e.*, no man who is moved by the spirit of truth could ever disparage and malign Jesus; 'and no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost'; *i.e.*, no man can enthrone Jesus in his life as One with the Divine right to command his complete loyalty, unless he is prompted by God and swayed by what is ultimately reliable. It is God the Holy Spirit who has put this faith in him, and therefore it is not illusion but inspiration.

1. The reassurance is that our confidence in Jesus is not self-made but God-made. If we believe in Jesus as God's Son and our Saviour, who holds the

key position in every menace, then it is not merely wishful thinking to comfort ourselves in an atomic age. No! Our belief is not our doing but God's doing, God thinking of us and in us, working in our experience. It is the Holy Ghost, *i.e.*, the supernatural person alongside of us and getting inside of us, to verify and vindicate Jesus, to glorify Him as the Master of human destiny, the Lord. Our faith is thus not a human illusion but a Divine inspiration. 'No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.'

It is God who produces the Christian outlook and attests it as eternally valid. It is His Spirit that illumines the faithless darkness to convince us about the ascendency of Jesus and to bring us into the light of truth. Helen Keller was seven years of age, blind, deaf and dumb, when Miss Sullivan came to teach her, to penetrate the gloom of that little life by her understanding touch, spelling words into her hand instead of speaking them, and brought the child into a new, entrancing world of knowledge, which so stirred her intelligence that at the age of ten she began to speak, and when she was a young woman she graduated with a B.A. degree. Here was an enlightened, developed, transformed life; but it was not Helen Keller's doing; it was Miss Sullivan's doing. 'She is thy liberator,' said the poet, Whittier, to Helen Keller, who wrote in her autobiography this tribute to her teacher: 'All the best of me belongs to her—there is not a talent, or an aspiration or a joy in me that has not been awakened by her loving touch.' What Miss Sullivan did for Helen Keller might be a parable on what the Holy Spirit does for us. All that is best in us belongs to that loving and patient Spirit of God awakening and training our nature and bringing it to full growth in the knowledge of truth. It is nothing less than God the Holy Ghost who educates us to exalt Jesus in our life, and therefore our exaltations of Jesus cannot be a mistake. Our estimate of Jesus is our response to a supernatural urge, which is not illusion but inspiration. 'No one can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.'

2. Denigration of Jesus is refuted by devotion to Jesus. On the one hand, 'no man speaking by the Spirit of God can call Jesus accursed.' No man can claim to have truth on his side when he defames Jesus as an obstruction to the progress and happiness of humanity. It was a distorted comfort which D. H. Lawrence sent to Katherine Mansfield when she was dying of consumption, 'Cheer up, Kate! Jesus is a back number,' a delusion which need no longer trouble her mind. Surely this is a queer perversion of reality. But if one is asked for definite proof that the Christian religion has not been a mischievous fable which has done more harm than good in history, the answer is to put the Christian religion to the test of practice and see how it works. 'Try it,' says Coleridge, 'Do not talk to me of the evidences of Christianity: try it. It has been eighteen hundred years in existence, and has one individual left a record like the following: "I have given Christianity a fair trial, I have performed the duties which it enjoins. Yet my assurance of its truth has received no increase. Its promises have not been fulfilled, and I repent me of my delusion." Neither your own experience nor the history of almost two thousand years has presented a single testimony to this purport.' 'No man speaking by the Spirit of God,' no one who has made an honest response to the spirit of truth in practice, 'calleth Jesus accursed,' a misleader of men. Denigration of Jesus is refuted by devotion to Jesus.

On the other hand, 'no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.' He need not fear that his adoration of Jesus as the Divine Saviour and Lord is merely a fanciful exaggeration of his own, a dream that can never come true, if it is the work of God's Spirit within him. Has it not produced a miracle of transformation in his fitness to cope with the demands and distresses of life—such a miracle as only God can produce? His Christian belief has vouched for itself by making him a new creation, a surprise to himself. The proof that his devotion to Jesus has not been misplaced is his new moral effectiveness, which is not self-evolved but God-instilled. Thus it cannot be an unwarranted assumption to put unbounded confidence in Jesus as 'the Prince of Life,' who grows more princely the more we know of Him.

> So, though the whole world fades and dies,
> I still find wonder in Thine eyes.

If self-commitment to Jesus as the redeeming Son of God has such increasing moral effect on us, it cannot be illusion but must be inspiration. 'No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost,' and denigration of Jesus is refuted by devotion to Jesus. You see, the Holy Spirit can be trusted as God's estimate of Jesus. What could be so reliable as the Father's verdict on the Son, and the Father gives His verdict through the Holy Spirit. The three persons in the Godhead thus attest one another, and the whole Trinity is involved in putting a song of Christian certainty into our mouth.

Contributions and Comments

Some New Testament References to Isaiah 53

It is now well recognised that proof from Scripture comprised an integral part of the primitive kerygma; that to speak of 'the deliberate counsel and foreknowledge of God' was for the first preachers and interpreters of the gospel much the same as saying 'according to the Scriptures.' The following note attempts to delineate further the use made of one such passage, Is 53, in 1 Peter and by Paul, with the special suggestion that a more articulate connexion than is usually recognized exists between this chapter and two statements of Paul: 2 Co 5^{21} and Ro 8^{3-4}. We begin with 1 Peter.

1 Peter 2 $^{22-25}$ obviously cites Is 53, though the reference is a free one and the sentences are not quoted exactly according to their order in the Old Testament passage. Attention is called to *vv.* 22 and 24:

(22) ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ· (24) ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν.

With these verses we consider also 1 P 3^{18}: *ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν (*add *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν) ἔπαθε (ἀπέθανε), δικαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ.*

We note (a) that the catena of quotations in the first passage is ostensibly meant to show the kind of example *(ὑπογραμμὸν)* Christ has left us, but before the passage ends an exemplary description has become a soteriological statement. (The same movement of thought occurs in the second passage.) And further, the verses from Is 53 have been worked over to point their application to the history of Jesus Christ *(ἐν τῳ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπι τὸ ξύλον).* Ethics is being taught against the background of a theology of the person and work of Christ based on Is 53. We are reminded of Professor Cullmann's claim that Peter was the first theologian of the death of Jesus as an atoning death for the forgiveness of sins and the first exponent of the Christological explanation of the person and work of Jesus in terms of the Suffering Servant of God in Second Isaiah. (See Cullmann, *Peter*, 65ff.) (b) In both of our two passages there is a final *ἵνα* indicative of the deliberate, redeeming activity of God manifest in the death of Christ; and (c) the mention of the 'many' in Is 53 is re-addressed to the present readers: *τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, ζήσωμεν* (2^{24}); *(ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν), ἡμᾶς* (3^{18}). We turn now to Paul.

2 Corinthians 5^{21}. It has already been suggested that *τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν* in this verse may echo Is 53^{9b} (J. Jeremias, *'παῖς Θεοῦ,' ThWZNT*, 708, n. 441) and that *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* likewise is associated with this Servant passage (*ib.*, 707, n. 435). But may we not go further? Is 53 $^{9b.10.11}$ (R.V.) read: (9) '. . . although he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.' (10) 'Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; . . .: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin. . . .' (11) 'He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many: and he shall bear their iniquities.'

It seems to me that this description is summarized point by point in 2 Co 5^{21}, though the allusion is general and free, utilizing the phraseology of neither the Massoretic text nor the Septuagint. Note the threefold representation of Christ:

τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν (Is 53^{9b}).
ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν (*v.* 10).
ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ (*v.* 11).

Romans 8^{3-4}. The same threefold description seems to underlie this summary of the plan of redemption, in which *ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας* would represent the first limb, *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* the second, and *ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν* the third.

In both of these passages by Paul we again have (a) a final *ἵνα* of redemptive purpose, describing the effects of the death of the sinless Christ for us sinners; and (b) the re-application of the 'many' of the Servant song to the present readers: *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἡμεῖς* (2 Corinthians), *ἐν ἡμῖν* (Romans). We may also notice (c) that in the second statement (Ro 8) continued reflection upon the primary pattern is more and more overlaying with dogmatic features the simple lineaments drawn from Is 53. When we meet a later example of this kind of description in Tit 2^{13-14}, the pattern does not depend on Is 53 and only the middle section offers a possible allusion to the Servant: *ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.*

The primary pattern we may now describe as follows: Christ (a) who had done no wrong, (b) was made an offering for our sins (c) that we might come into a right relationship with God through Him.

Galatians 3^{13-14} is interesting in this connexion. A somewhat similar pattern is here based on other proofs from Scripture and dependent on Is 53 only perhaps for the ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. It is interesting that the basic Scripture quoted in these verses ('Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree,' Dt 21^{22-23}) also had an influence on 1 Peter's description of Christ based on Is 53, namely, in the ἐπι τὸ ξύλον of 1 P 2^{24} (cf. also Ac 5^{30}, 10^{39}). The two passages were probably linked together early (see especially Ac 13^{27-29}) because the Servant who had done no wrong (Is 53) suffered precisely in the way of one who had committed a crime punishable by death (Dt 21), and therefore not for his own but for others' sin.

'The Christological interpretation of the Deutero-Isaianic Servant of God belongs to the beginnings of the Christian Church and was very early fixed as a formula,' Professor Jeremias concludes. As we have mentioned, Professor Cullman considers its first exponent to have been Peter and states that it 'certainly goes back to Jesus himself,' a conclusion for which Professor Jeremias also argues. The evidence adduced above seems to indicate that Paul was more indebted to this tradition than is sometimes allowed. He took his stand squarely on what he also had 'received' and was pleased to 'deliver' further, as of first importance, the tradition 'that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures' (1 Co 15^{3}), among which Is 53 ranks as foremost.

JOHN HOAD

Demerara

The New-Born King

DR. NIGEL TURNER, in his interesting note in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (lxviii. [January 1957] 122), says, 'It is probably too much to hope that Charles Wesley and the rest owe to grammatical considerations their phrase, "Glory to the new-born King!"' Had Charles Wesley been so influenced it would not have been unparalleled; but if a point of detail may be mentioned, he did not write 'Glory to the new-born King!' In the original version the hymn opens,

> Hark how all the welkin rings,
> Glory to the King of kings.
> (*Poetical Works*, i. 183).

The alteration first appears in George Whitefield's collection of hymns of 1753. The simple phrase 'new-born King' is, however, used by Wesley in other hymns on the Nativity (*Poetical Works*, iv. 117, 118) as is 'newly born King' (*ib.* iv. 113, 122) and 'new-born Monarch' (iv. 117); and also 'new-born Prince of Peace' (iv. 115), and 'new-born Saviour' (iv. 124).

A. F. WALLS

Cambridge

Entre Nous

Strength to Live with God

There are not a few men who possess great scholarship, and there are not a few men who possess great depth of spiritual life, but there are very few men who can communicate something of their own greatness and their own experience to others. Professor Nels F. S. Ferré is such a man. His book *Strengthening the Spiritual Life* [1] is not a long book. It has only sixty-four pages in it; but no one will put it down without a clearer idea of what the spiritual life is, and of practical means towards strengthening it.

Professor Ferré tells how his wife had a dream that she had to write an essay on 'How to Stop Worrying.' In the dream she was able to write an inspired flow of words; but when she awoke she could remember only the three points of the outline: 'Worship, work and wait.' That, says Professor Ferré, is the Divine formula for all who need relief from worry. He goes on to expand it.

'Worship is the baring of one's whole life unto God. . . . Worship is the finding and the acceptance of the real . . . Worship is the soul's intercourse with God. . . . To worship is to be gripped by God . . . Worship is . . . the living in and by eternity.' If that be so there is little wonder that 'the worship of God is the end of worry.' Worship enables us to see ourselves as we are; and maybe greatest of all is in worship to see ourselves sinning, to feel ourselves loved, and to know ourselves forgiven and in the presence of God. Worship is also to see things as they are, and when that happens 'the victories of the world are scaled down to size.'

There are many motives for work. Some work to 'get ahead.' Some work for ambition. Some work for escape, feeling that when they are buried in work they are immune to worry. But none of these ways is right. 'Work is a medium of fellowship with God and men.'

Hardest of all is to wait. And yet 'our capacity for waiting shows our concrete trust in God.' It is hard to wait for God. We feel that 'the world is wrong, and we are here to right it, at once. The zeal of many a reformer is disguised atheism.' The waiting of the Christian is not merely 'interested watching.' It is 'concerned waiting.' It is being 'personally invested in the result.' Further, it is 'victorious waiting,' for we can be sure that

[1] Collins; 6s. net.

'though we have unsolved problems, God has none.' Such waiting is 'living within the perspective, pace and proportion of God.'

Professor Ferré has a wonderful chapter on *Personal Devotions* and on private prayer. This chapter is full of wise counsel. 'The first rule of prayer is to learn *relaxation*.' 'God has made the world self-defeating for the self-serious.' It is better to pray lying down than to kneel in stiff discomfort, although there are times when a man's first instinct is to kneel. There must be spiritual relaxation as well as physical relaxation. To attain it a man may put himself wholly in the hands of God saying: 'Holy Spirit, take me as I am and do thou help me to pray. Here I put myself in thy hands completely. Receive me completely, both my willing and my unwilling parts.' Next there comes *recollection*. This involves the recalling of who God is. 'He is both ultimate reality and our most intimate friend.' It is only a pagan who needs to bow and scrape and plead before his god. But we must also recollect that 'God loves everyone completely.' And, therefore, we cannot pray selfishly, but only when we are 'surrendered to the common good.' Prayer is *communion*. There must therefore be in it quietness, that there may not only be speech, but the silence of listening, and of that communion which is beyond even listening. Prayer begins with *adoration* which is 'the self's finding reality and rest.' It is that in which we understand a 'fragment of the future.' *Adoration* will immediately overflow into gratitude; and intercession and petition for service will pour out along with thanksgiving.

It is but natural that Professor Ferré should have a section on the reading of the Bible. It must be read *slowly*, never skimmed. It must be read *devotionally*, but that does not mean parking the mind outside. Some time must be spent in '*dwelling with the great saints of the Church*.' And there must be *study*. The best stimulus to keep going is a partner or a group with whom we discuss that which we read.

We have said nothing about the loveliest chapter in the book—the chapter on 'Family Worship.' This whole book is the outcome of personal experience. Professor Ferré tells how once he was weeks in pain and was very discouraged. His mother heard him praying: 'Dear Lord, if thou wilt ever have me well and use me again, thy will be done; if not, thy will be done anyway.' 'Nels,' she said, 'that's no way to pray. Thank Him and praise Him; thank Him and praise Him.'

Professor Ferré's experience of life has given him the right to speak, for he himself is not only one of life's scholars; he is also one of life's victors. The only real authority is the authority of personal experience, and from this book of rare beauty that authority breathes forth.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Love Requires a Just System

'Certainly, the Christian life often demands heroic fortitude and renunciations, but that is a vocation not to be required of all men, and the social order should not assume it. Christians should protest against any social or technical development which is dangerous or harmful, especially when it is defended on the grounds that if human nature were perfect it would be a blessing instead of a curse. . . . There are many forms of self-deception which use the language of religion for overlooking the frailty of man. One is to say that if men's hearts were right there would be no need to bother about the system. But it is just because men are not pure in heart and perfect in wisdom that we have systems to maintain some sort of decency and order among sinners. And love for the unknown millions requires a just social system. We shall not be free of the needs of organization short of the compete freedom of the Kingdom of Heaven.'

This quotation is taken from *A Two-Way Religion* (Mowbray; 5s. net), in which the Rev. Canon V. A. Demant has brought together two series of his Broadcast Talks. The two ways are respectively the inward movement to the Divine realm and the outward movement to the neighbour and society. The author describes both ways with his usual knowledge and judgment and so makes a book really helpful to the earnest Christian.

Association of British Theological and Philosophical Libraries

This Association has just been formed and the first *Bulletin* in connexion with it has been issued. During 1957 it is hoped there will be three Bulletins and that they will include accounts of The National Central Library and the national inter-library lending service.

There will also be an account of the British National Book Centre, which is the main channel through which exchanges of surplus material are made. Accounts of specific libraries and collections of books will also be given.

Full information may be got from the Hon. Secretary, Miss J. Ferrier, c/o C.M.S. Library, 6 Salisbury Square, London, E.C.4.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.